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Introduction

I. Focus of Study

Fall 1963:

On October 29, 1963, the Bishops of the United States played a pivotal role in the Vatican II vote to incorporate a previously separate document on the Virgin Mary as a single chapter in the schema “on the Church,” the Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen Gentium*.

Before the vote was taken, the day’s moderator, Gregorio Cardinal Agagianian, assured the Council Fathers gathered in Saint Peter’s that:

No vote on either side can be construed as constituting any lessening of the dignity of the Blessed Virgin or any diminution of her preeminent role the Church.¹

The assurance given at the Council that day proved almost immediately problematic. The decision to combine the schema on Our Lady with the schema on the Church was made by 1,114 Bishops voting in favor and 1,070 voting in opposition; the required majority was only 1,097. Thus, by a margin of 17 votes, the Bishops in Council had made a decision, but had shown a virtual 50–50 split on the Marian question.

The next morning, Americans read front-page newspaper headlines such as:

“*Council Votes to De-Emphasis Mary*” – The Rome American


“*Victory for Minimalists, Christian Unity*” – The New York Herald Tribune ²
The newspapers reported correctly that in the Council hall itself, when the results of the voting had been announced, there was none of the usual applause – only silence.

Fall 1973:

An uneasy decade later – called by some “the decade of silence about Mary” – the Bishops of the United States issued their first-ever Pastoral Letter on the Virgin: Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith.

John Cardinal Carberry of St. Louis announced in Washington, D.C. on Nov. 21, 1973: “Through our pastoral letter, we, your Bishops, hope to set aside completely the report that Vatican Council II had de-emphasized love and devotion to Mary.”

In the post-Conciliar years, the previously-thundering sounds of Marian devotion in the U.S. Church were stilled. Mary’s role in the Church became unclear to many. The decade from 1963 and 1973 did indeed seem to be the time of a “Marian crisis.”

The reasons were many and varied. Cardinal Newman had written that there had seldom been a Council without great confusion after it. Rene Laurentin identified seven “movements” which inevitably affected the Church and Mariology immediately before, during and after the Council. Eamon R. Carroll, O.Carm., the principal author of Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith, maintained that “there was unrest…seething like a volcano. Something had to give, and it blew up in an extremely common, recognizable aspect of Roman Catholic life – devotion to Our Lady, in all its manifestations.”

This study is the first and only in-depth history and analysis of the U.S. Bishops’ Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith. The Pastoral Letter was written in response to the crisis in Marian devotion, often traced to the 1963 conciliar decision on Mary and Lumen Gentium. That vote demonstrated a polarization among the Council Fathers not unlike that which was to manifest itself frequently in the U.S. Church during the post-Conciliar period. The history of the three-year-long period of writing the Pastoral Letter (from 1970 to 1973) is studied, as are some of the letter’s effects – especially in light of Pope Paul VI’s Marialis Cultus.
Hence, the purpose of this dissertation is both a history and an analysis of:

1) the reasons for, 2) the writing of, and 3) the effects of the United States Bishops’ Pastoral Letter, *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*, which:

a) attempted to present to the faithful a careful study and amplification of the Church’s teaching on Mary –

b) especially (and to varying degrees of satisfaction) the teaching of the Council in *Lumen Gentium* Chapter Eight –

c) in order to resolve the crisis in Marian devotion and, with *Marialis Cultus*, bring to an end “the decade of silence”:

*Lumen Gentium* and *Marialis Cultus* provide not only the beginning and end of the time frame for this study, but also the textual bases for comparative analyses of the Mariology in *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*. Additionally, they frame this study within two dimensions: the theological and the devotional.
II. A Short History of *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*

A. The Reasons for the Letter

By 1970, a number of Catholic Bishops in the United States believed there was a need to produce a letter explaining what Vatican II had said about the Mother of Jesus. Aware of the anxieties of many Catholics, they were concerned about the drastic decline in Marian devotion throughout the 1960’s; and, in the aftermath of the Council, they questioned the uncomfortable silence about Mary in parishes and schools, in sermons and homilies, in catechesis and in spiritual conferences, and drastic reduction in specific Marian devotions.

The Bishops produced the Pastoral Letter, *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*, seeking to articulate the doctrine and desires of the Second Vatican Council. The conciliar chapter on the Blessed Virgin had a rather skeletal character, with much of its wealth in its footnotes.

The Council Fathers and the Conciliar *periti* – “not having it in mind” to give a complete doctrine on Mary (LG, 54) – intended follow-up studies to “flesh out their outlines,” according to Father Carroll.7

The Pastoral Letter on Mary had been proposed in the fall of 1970 at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, D.C. Cardinal Carberry and other members of the Shrine’s Board of Directors described the need primarily as “re-animating devotion to Our Lady.”

B. The Writing of the Letter

By September 1971, the letter had been outlined by the *ad hoc committee* and included two parts: a brief introduction summarizing the main Catholic beliefs about Mary (prepared by the Bishop members themselves) and a much longer principal part with doctrinal explanation and application to Catholic life (produced by theological consultant members of the committee).

The National Conference of Catholic Bishops’ (NCCB) “*ad hoc* committee for the Pastoral Letter on Mary” met during the annual Bishops’ meeting in November 1971.
Present were Cardinal Carberry; Archbishop (later Cardinal) Timothy Manning of Los Angeles; Archbishop (later Cardinal) Humberto Medeiros of Boston; Bishop (later Cardinal) William W. Baum of Springfield/Cape Girardeau, Missouri; Bishop David W. Maloney of Wichita, Kansas; Bishop John Dougherty, auxiliary of Newark, N.J.; Monsignor William McDonough, Rector of the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, and Father Eamon R. Carroll, O. Carm, professor of theology at the Catholic University of America.

They discussed the outline and – as the NCCB leadership under John Cardinal Dearden and then-Bishop Joseph Bernardin insisted – agreed that the text’s body would be a treatment of the teaching found in *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII.8

The theological consultants to the ad hoc committee were Richard Kugelman, CP (President of the Catholic Biblical Association); Frederick M. Jelly, OP (of the Dominican House of Studies); Monsignor Thomas B. Falls (from the Archdiocese of Philadelphia); Hugh O’Connell, C.Ss.R. (advisor to Cardinal Carberry); and Father Carroll.

Father Carroll was to be the “architect” of the Pastoral Letter – the “anchor man” handling the input of Bishops and theologians.9

In May 1972, the Bishops and consultants met in Washington, D.C. to consider Draft A. Draft B was sent to all the Bishops later that summer. After further rewriting the *ad hoc* committee produced Draft C for the Bishops’ consideration in late 1972 and early 1973.

By March 1973, when the full committee met in St. Louis at the request of Cardinal Carberry, many Bishops had replied to Draft C. Bernard Theall, OSB agreed to serve as stylist for Draft D.

Throughout the writing period, more than 60 Bishops from throughout the U.S. submitted hundreds of *modi* – some general, some quite specific.10

In April and May 1973, the Pastoral Letter was presented and voted on during 12 regional meetings of the Bishops. At each regional meeting, either a Bishop-member of the *ad hoc* committee or one of the
theological consultants was present. The result of each region’s voting was sent to the NCCB.

On June 20, 1973, Father Carroll appeared before the Executive Committee of the NCCB – 30 Bishops under the chairmanship of the conference’s new President, John Cardinal Krol of Philadelphia – to answer additional questions.

Meanwhile, the Redemptorist Father O’Connell – one of the theological consultants – developed discussion questions to be printed at the letter’s conclusion and also produced an analytical table of contents. A reading list of a dozen entries was prepared.

C. The Effects of the Letter

*Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* was promulgated on Nov. 21, 1973 – the Feast of the Presentation of Mary (the same date *Lumen Gentium* had been promulgated a decade earlier at Vatican II).

The Publications Office of the United States Catholic Conference (USCC), representing the NCCB, published the Pastoral Letter simultaneously in English and in Spanish (*Aqui a Tu Madre: La Mujer de Fe*).

The weekly English *L’Osservatore Romano* carried the complete text of U.S. Bishops’ Marian letter in three installments, beginning before the year was out.11

Several diocesan newspapers in the U.S. also printed it in its entirety. *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* was reprinted for the Catholics of Australia; for the Church in France and French-speaking Canada (as *Voici ta Mere, La Femme de Foi*); for Italians (as *Ecco tua Madre, Una Donna di Fede*); for the Catholics of Hungary; and by the Catholic Information Service in Kerala, India. It was widely distributed by the join Bishops’ Conference of Latin America (Consejo Episcopal Latino Americano – CELAM).

In late 1973, the National Shrine in Washington, D.C. formed a “Committee for the Implementation of the Pastoral Letter,” which began
planning almost immediately for a variety of catechetical tools based on the letter.¹²

Less than three months after the appearance ofBehold Your Mother Woman of Faith, Pope Paul VI issued for the Universal Church the Apostolic ExhortationMarialis Cultus‘for the right ordering and development of devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary.”
III. Timeline – “Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith”

1970  (November)
Pastoral Letter on BVM proposed during meeting at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, Washington, D.C.; Cardinal Carberry contacts Bishop Bernardin of NCCB.

1971  (March)
Through Cardinal Carberry, various theologians unofficially consulted.

(April)
Cardinal Dearden strongly suggests placing BVM in context of LG 8.

(Summer)
Bishops/theologian members determined; outline of proposed letter.

(November)
Ad Hoc Committee meets in Washington, D.C.

1972  (March)
Draft A by Father Carroll for Ad Hoc Committee members only.

(May)
Ad Hoc Committee meets re Draft A.

(July/August)
Draft B sent to all Bishops; their modi received.

(Late)
Ad Hoc Committee reworks second draft.
1973

(January/February)

Draft C sent to all Bishops; their modi received.

(January 22)
Roe v Wade decision focuses NCCB activity on abortion question.

(March)
Ad Hoc Committee meets; Father Theal agrees to serve as stylist.

(April/May)
Draft D Presentation/Voting at 12 regional meetings of U.S. Bishops

(June)
Fr Carroll answers questions from Cardinal Krol and NCCB Exec Committee

(Summer/Fall)
Final manuscript/Plans for publication/Spanish translation

(November 21)
Pastoral Letter is promulgated at Mass in National Shrine during NCCB meeting in Washington D.C.

1974

(January)
Meetings begin regarding implementation of Pastoral Letter

(February)
Pope Paul VI issues Marialis Cultus
IV. Methodology Both Historical and Analytical

This study of *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* proceeds in a linear, narrative, historical manner. It also includes a synthesis comparing the Pastoral Letter to *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII (which preceded it and on which it was to be based) and another comparing the Pastoral Letter to *Marialis Cultus* (which soon followed it) in order to make final conclusions about its theological and devotional impact.

This paper, treating the reasons for, the writing of and the effects of the U.S. Bishops’ *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*, has as its primary time frame the years 1970–1973 (through the four drafts of the letter). It focuses especially on the work of the members of the “ad hoc committee for a Pastoral Letter on Mary” and on the numerous *modi* of the Bishops themselves.

The Introduction presents the focus, content and method of the dissertation as well as a General Review of the sources.

Chapter 1 is a study of the historical context of the Pastoral Letter. It surveys the U.S. Bishops’ doctrinal and devotional approaches prior to the Council (especially from 1950); it addresses the role of the U.S. Bishops in the decision to include the previously separate schema on the Blessed Virgin Mary in *Lumen Gentium*\(^1\); the first chapter concludes with an examination of the place of Mary in the years immediately following the Council – often called “the decade of silence.”

Chapter 2 studies the requests for and the earliest suggestions about writing a Pastoral Letter on the Blessed Virgin Mary. These requests and suggestions were forthcoming from some Bishops, from clergy and religious, and from some members of the laity.

Similar – and much briefer – Pastoral Letters written by the Bishops’ conferences of other countries are noted. The chapter further deals with the eventual decision by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops to write the Pastoral Letter and takes into account a certain degree of tension between NCCB leadership/
staff and a number of Bishops and theologians regarding the use of *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII as the exclusive model for the outline and content of the Pastoral Letter.

Chapter 3 treats the work of the theologian-members of the ad hoc committee who wrote the Pastoral Letter (through the drafts) and considers the role of the Bishops themselves, especially through the *modi* they submitted. The chapter also notes the effect of the momentous Jan. 22, 1973 Roe v. Wade decision on the status and priority of *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*. The chapter ends with reports on the final approval – not at all unanimous – given by the Bishops to the Pastoral Letter.

After this presentation of the letter’s history, Chapter 4 provides a synthesis of the teaching in *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* and two analyses of the 1973 Pastoral Letter. The first analysis relates to the Marian chapter in *Lumen Gentium* and the second compares the letter to *Marialis Cultus*, which followed *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* by less than three months. The “grid” for the first analysis is based on Laurentin’s list of the seven Conciliar-era “movements” which influenced Mariology; biblical, patristic, ecclesiological, salvation historical, liturgical, missiological, and ecumenical; the second analysis is based on Paul VI’s “aspects of” and “guidelines for” devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Finally, Chapter 5 is conclusion, tracing lightly both theology and devotion after *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*. This consideration is made within the framework of five years, the events from 1973 to 1978: the attempts to implement *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*, and validation from Paul VI’s *Marialis Cultus*, the synodal document *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, and the election of John Paul II. Did the Bishops achieve the goal suggested by Father Carroll, namely, that the American Bishops and the Holy Father had the same goal and hope: in the discouraging malaise of the years after the Council to demonstrate the unshakeable place of the Mother of Jesus in Catholic thoughts and piety, to answer the fears and dismay of the faithful by opening up the riches of the Second Vatican Council.
V. General Review of the Sources

Virtually all the primary sources for this study have been unexamined for three decades. They include:

Materials from various archives. These were found in unordered, random condition – in cardboard storage boxes, in file folders, in piles of note paper; the materials have been placed in chronological order, an archival listing made of them, and a copy of the entire collection – running to thousands of pages – given to the Marian Library, Dayton, Ohio.

- United States Conference of Catholic Bishops’ archives. Gathered during two trips to USCCB headquarters in Washington, D.C., through the kindness of the conference President and General Secretary. Found in files in various locations dating from 1970 to 1973.

- Basilica of National Shrine of Immaculate Conception archives. During a week spent at the Shrine offices, a complete set of materials pertaining to the Pastoral Letter was gathered, dating from 1970 to the mid-1980’s.

The abundant materials from these archival sources include letters, *modi*, memos, minutes of meetings, pertinent correspondence. Most of the files, minutes, and other materials in the various archives had not been opened or read since they were placed in the archives at the Bishops’ Conference and the National Shrine sometime after 1974.

- Personal files of Father Eamon Carroll, principal author of the Pastoral Letter. During visits to Father Carroll’s residence in Florida, hundreds of pages of theological notes regarding the Pastoral Letter were obtained from his personal files.

(Materials from the three archives above have been orderly arranged. Each letter, note, memo etc. is listed in chronological order and given a reference number:

The first number is the *year*;
It is followed by the month and the date;

The last letters indicate the original source of the material:

BpC – Bishops’ Conference archives

NSh – National Shrine archives

ERC – Father Carroll’s personal files

The following archives provided materials, which are specifically footnoted when reference is made:

- Arch/diocesan archives from throughout the United States. In response to a letter sent to all arch/diocesan archivists asking for pertinent Marian materials from the U.S. Bishops from 1950 onward. Forty-eight dioceses replied. These too have been given to Marian Library.

- Personal files of Father Thomas Coyle, C.Ss.R. from his time as peritus at Vatican II (especially during the Mariological debate of 1963), through the kindness of the archivist of the Redemptorists in Denver, Col.

Oral Histories taped and transcribed:

- With Father Carroll during the summers of 2002/2003. Eight hours of interviews conducted at the Marion Library at the University of Dayton, taped and transcribed. (See Appendix ).

- With Cardinal Carberry from 1982, following his retirement as Archbishop of St. Louis. Two-hour interview regarding the role of Blessed Virgin Mary in the Church after the Second Vatican Council.

The Pastoral Letter itself:

- Four drafts, written between 1971 and 1973 – some with amendments and marginal notes by the members of the ad hoc committee.
Draft A: No copy was kept; notes were saved.

Draft B: Copy of actual draft with changes, from Bishop Dougherty.

Draft C: clean copy of actual draft.

Draft D: clean copy of actual draft.

- References are listed in the final version of the Pastoral Letter.

Proceedings of Mariological Society of America:


(Secondary resources, such as commentaries, reviews, journal articles, books on the period and general works on Mariology are listed in the Bibliography.)

Notes


5 Oral History 229 with Eamon R. Carroll, O.Carm., priest, Marian scholar and professor, who was principal author of *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*. Father Carroll (1921–2008), an Irish-American Carmelite priest,
was born in Chicago. After studies leading to an S.T.D. in Rome, he taught Carmelites there until he returned to the United States – where he taught for long periods first at the Catholic University of America in Washington D.C. and later Loyola University of Chicago. After working on the U.S. Bishops’ *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* from 1970 to 1973, he lectured extensively on the Virgin Mary throughout the United States and Australia. In his retirement, he continues to serve at the International Marian Research Institute in Dayton, Ohio, and to deliver his annual “Survey of Recent Mariology” at the Mariological Society of America’s annual meetings.

6 Even “today, deep polarization exists among American Catholics about Mary, mirroring worldwide currents and conflicts inside the Roman Catholic Church as well as conservative and progressive factions specific to the American Church.” Paula M. Kane, “Marian Devotion since 1940: Continuity or Casualty?” James M. O’Toole, ed. Habits of Devotion (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 256.

7 Carroll, Oral History, 239

8 This aspect of the genesis of the Pastoral Letter will be treated at length in Chapter 2 – with materials from the Archives of the NCCB, especially statements by Cardinal Dearden and by the NCCB Administrative Board and in memos from the Conference’s General Secretariat.

9 Carroll, Oral History, 240.

10 Copies of the Bishops letters containing these *modi* were discovered in the Archives of the USCCB and the Archives of the Basilica of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, during two trips to do research in Washington, D.C.


12 As indicated in files from the Archives of the Basilica of the National Shrine of Immaculate Conception, Washington D.C., dated December 1973 until several years later.

13 Considered are recently discovered texts of the four important talks given by *periti* to the U.S. Bishops on the evening prior to the Oct. 27, 1963 Conciliar vote.


15 Carroll, Oral History, 237
Chapter 1 – Historical Context:  
The U.S. Bishops and Mary  
Before, During and After the Council

This chapter provides the historical context out of which the Bishops of the United States eventually chose to publish the Pastoral Letter Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith. The first part of the chapter reviews the Bishops’ treatment of Marian doctrine and devotion in the U.S. before Vatican II; the second part of the chapter focuses on the U.S. Bishops’ involvement in the Marian questions that arose during the Council; Finally, the third part of the chapter details the reactions of the U.S. Bishops’ (and not others) to the “Marian crisis” in the years immediately following the Council.

1.1 The U.S. Bishops and Mary in the Years Before the Council

“The Church in America has been constantly faithful to devotion to Mary.”

1.1a On Doctrine: The Marian Dogmas and the Voices of the U.S. Bishops

During the first 200 years of history of the Catholic hierarchy in the United States, two dogmatic definitions concerning the Virgin Mary were promulgated for the Universal Church: the Immaculate Conception (1854) and the Assumption (1950).

An examination of the roles of the U.S. Bishops in the promulgation of these two Marian dogmas provides anecdotal bookends to analyze the Bishops’ approach to doctrine in the century prior to the Second Vatican Council. In sort, they supported the two newly proclaimed dogmas, but seemed to have little time to teach about them.

i The Immaculate Conception

In 1846 – eight years before the dogmatic definition of the Immaculate Conception – the Bishops of the United States petitioned Rome for the designation of Mary, the Immaculate Conception as national patroness.
“It is interesting to note,” the American John Cardinal Wright commented, “how the Blessed Mother, under the title of the Immaculate Conception, came to be chosen as the patroness of the United States.” At the Sixth Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1846 – with 23 U.S. Bishops and the representatives of four religious orders present – the Blessed Virgin Mary, conceived without original sin, was chosen as patroness of the province.

The next year, on Feb. 7, 1847 – this patronage was extended to the entire country and “the Bishops at the First Plenary Council of Baltimore, held in 1852, confirmed all the previous enactments of the nation’s seven provincial councils.”

Daniel Sargent, in his 1939 meditation on Our Land and Our Lady, placed the Bishops’ invocation of the Immaculate Conception squarely within 19th century American experience:

In 1846, not long after the Native American riots, there met in Baltimore the sixth provincial council. While it was meeting, the armies of the U.S. were entering New Mexico and California. We were taking over more lands, which the Spaniards had dedicated to the Immaculate Conception. Those in the council were not thinking of invading armies. They had no way of knowing even whether they were conquering or being conquered. Yet they seemed unconsciously in one act of theirs to be preparing our land to take over Spain’s old responsibilities…tightening the bond between the Church in our country and the Mother of God. It was a spontaneous act, therefore, when in this council permission was sought from Rome that we be allowed to elect as our patroness, her, who to the immigrants was not only their life, their sweetness, and their hope but also their only true equality, only true liberty, only true fraternity, the “Blessed Virgin Conceived Without Sin.”

Cardinal Wright called it “a joy to Catholic Americans” that the designation of the Immaculate Conception as the U.S. patroness was
made eight years before the solemn definition of the dogma. The U.S. Bishops, he added, were specially graced by their action:

One cannot doubt that it has also been a source of special graces to the United States and, one ventures to say, to the hierarchy which officially took the action by which this happy choice was made in 1846. It is surely is not too much to suggest that the Blessed Mother must have exercised a providential patronage over the proceedings of the Plenary Council itself and, as a result, over the myriad aspects of Catholic American life subsequently influenced by it.”

Yet the same U.S. Bishops, in their various editions of the Baltimore Catechism, said little about Mary. In only a very few questions is Mary mentioned directly:

— How was the Son of God made man?

The Son of God was conceived and made man by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

— When was the Son of God conceived and made Man?

The Son of God was conceived and made man on Annunciation Day, the day on which the Angel Gabriel announced to the Blessed Virgin Mary that she was to be the Mother of God.

— Is St. Joseph the father of Jesus Christ?

Jesus Christ had no human father, but St. Joseph was the spouse of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the guardian, or foster father, of Christ.

— When was Christ born?

Christ was born of the Blessed Virgin Mary on Christmas Day, in Bethlehem, 1,900 years ago.

In the alphabetical index to the catechism’s early editions, there is no reference to Mary. She was not a major topic in the Baltimore
Nevertheless, the United States was “the land of Mary Immaculate.”

ii The Assumption

From 1846 to 1958, the number of Catholic Bishops in the U.S. grew from 23 to 119.

By invoking the patronage of the Immaculate Conception for the nation, the U.S. Bishops as a unified body had taken a prescient role in the 1854 definition – which is said by some to have commenced the so-called “Marian century.” Their role as an episcopal body in the dogmatic definition of the Assumption nearly a hundred years later was less focused.

Even though the Bishops had replaced the occasional provincial and plenary councils with the regularly scheduled meetings of their National Catholic Welfare Conference (NCWC), each Bishop’s own arch/diocesan responsibilities by necessity dealt with other than universal doctrinal matters. The 20th century saw a building boom in the Church in the U.S. as Catholic immigrants produced second — and third — generation Catholic families, filling and then overflowing ethnic and Catholic neighborhoods, towns, and cities.

New suburban churches, schools, seminaries, convents and hospitals were built at the instigation of Bishops in virtually every diocese across the country.

“As Bishops of a growing, developing Church, the American Bishops had to become builders, administrators and financiers,” wrote Monsignor Vincent Yzermans, historian of the U.S. Bishops at the Second Vatican Council. “To shirk these duties would mean a real neglect of interests which were essentially the proper functioning of the Church.”

Regarding the Assumption, the U.S. Bishops individually did as requested by Pope Pius XII.

In each arch/diocese, the local Ordinary arranged for the questioning of the faithful to determine whether it was opportune to proclaim
Mary’s Assumption as dogma. The responses of the faithful were overwhelmingly favorable, and the Bishops sent the results to Rome.\textsuperscript{12}

When the time arrived for the Assumption’s dogmatic definition, typical among the nation-wide observances was the instruction of Oct. 29, 1950 from Bishop William Mulloy of the Diocese of Covington in Kentucky.\textsuperscript{13}

To the Right Reverend, Very Reverend, and Reverend Clergy, to our Venerable Religious, and beloved members of the Laity:

His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, will, on Nov. 1, 1950, solemnly and infallibly define the Dogma of the Assumption of Our Blessed Lady into Heaven an article of Faith.

Bishop Mulloy clarified the content of the dogma, placing it within the \textit{depositum fidei} which, of course, the Bishops were entrusted to preserve:

…His Holiness will not be adding a new article of Faith. He will simply declare that the action which he takes is but giving concrete expression to what the Church means when she says that Mary was assumed into Heaven. The Assumption…was contained in the Divine Deposit of revealed truths given to the Church by God – revelation which ceased with the death of the last Apostle.

Quickly, the Bishop’s diocesan-wide letter left the areas of theological discourse and moved on to the Faithful’s proper devotion to Mary in light of the Assumption:

In this century which we call the “Marian Century,” Catholics on all levels of life will sing hymns of genuine gratitude to God for this crowning glory of their love and esteem for Our Blessed Lady. Mary brought Christ into this world of ours – through Her Christ came to us. Mary’s Assumption into Heaven reminds us that through Her we will go back to Christ. Christ through Mary to us; we through Christ to Mary.\textsuperscript{14}
It is emblematic of the time that celebrations both liturgical and devotional were mentioned in the same breath:

And so, dearly beloved in Christ, rejoice with our brethren the world over on Nov. 1…Attend Mass, receive Holy Communion, recite your Rosary and the Litany of Loretto with all fervor.15

Even though a “liturgical movement” which was growing in Europe had begun to find roots in the United States, the U.S. Bishops, “weighed down by apostolic labors, had too little time for theological problems”16, including – apparently – preserving the distinctions between liturgy and devotion.

Summarily, the U.S. Bishops were men who gave voice to and acted with happy adherence to the Marian dogmas coming from Rome, even before 1854 and well into the 1950’s. At the same time, their ever-increasing day-to-day administrative and managerial responsibilities for a growing Church did not allow them the time or opportunity for profound theological reflection.

Thus, the volume of popular Marian devotion would increase significantly, especially in the 1950’s, without an accompanying increase in the sounds of theological discourse.

1.1b On Devotion: The Bishops and the Swelling Voices of Marian Devotion

i From Bishop Carroll to Cardinal Gibbons and into the 1950’s

In the 1790s, John Carroll was consecrated the first Bishop of Baltimore. At the time, his diocese was coterminous with the entirety of the U.S. In his first Pastoral Letter – as in nearly everything he wrote – Bishop Carroll promoted devotion to Mary, the Mother of God:

I add this, my earnest request, that to the exercise of the sublimest virtues, faith, hope and charity, you will join a fervent and well regulated devotion to the Holy Mother of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; that you will place great
confidence in her intercession; and have recourse to her in all your necessities. Having chosen her the special patroness of this diocese, you are placed, of course, under her powerful protection; and it becomes your duty to be careful to deserve its continuance by a zealous imitation of her virtues, and reliance on her motherly superintendence.”17

This exhortation came at the end of Bishop Carroll’s first letter; quite regularly, devotion to Mary was a brief concluding thought, if not an afterthought, in many letters of the Catholic hierarchy.

Later in the 19th century, the titular “primate” of the United States’ episcopacy recognized the importance of Marian devotion to the American Catholic people. “It is absolutely necessary that religion should continue to possess the affections” of the Catholic populace, James Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore wrote. “Devotions thus rule the conduct of the multitudes.”18

Historically, such was the common posture of the U.S. hierarchy; very rarely, however, did this shared attitude of the U.S. Bishops lead to common statements on Mary or Marian devotion. In the first half of the 20th century, only a 1919 “Pastoral Letter issued by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of the United States” even mentions Mary. Even though the devotional life of an immigrant Church was surely spurred on by the First World War, the economic depression of the 1930’s and the Second World War in the 1940’s 19, the Bishops as a group wrote little about Mary. In only two of the 1919 letter’s wide-ranging 206 paragraphs did the Bishops’ conference mention “Mary the Mother of Christ”:

(29) What grace can accomplish in His creatures, God has shown in the person of her whom He chose to be His mother. The unique privilege of Mary…entitles her to reverence and honor; but in the Catholic mind, it is love that prompts veneration for the Mother of Christ…

(30) In keeping with her singular dignity is the power of Mary’s intercession… With good reason, then, does the Church encourage the faithful to cultivate a tender devotion for the Blessed Virgin.20
Hence, the devotion to Mary – especially relying on her powerful intercession – was based on her unique privileges.

A regional pastoral letter with a Marian theme was produced late in the year 1950 by six Catholic Bishops of Kentucky and Indiana:

Dearly Beloved in Christ,

It is our firm conviction…that we can reap untold benefits from a return to the traditional family prayer of our faith – the Rosary. Therefore, we call upon priests, religious and faithful to join with us in the American Family Rosary Crusade… …Its purpose shall be to have every man, woman and child who can say the Rosary, pledged to its daily family recitation.

The letter was read from the pulpit of each Church in the six dioceses at all Masses on Sunday, Oct. 8, 1950.21

As an example of episcopal collegiality, the joint Pastoral Letter for Kentucky/Indiana demonstrated above all else that the devotional life and practices of America’s Catholic people – as well as those of the clergy and the religious – were all meant to be tied to the guidance and supervision of the individual Bishops. Across the country, the U.S. Bishops in their arch/dioceses allowed the Faithful to participate widely and readily in the Rosary and other Marian devotions.

At mid-20th century, the U.S. Bishops permitted the Redemptorists to spread their novena to Our Mother of Perpetual Help in parishes; the Bishops allowed the Carmelites to preach on Our Lady of Mount Carmel and the wearing of the brown scapular; and the Bishops endorsed the Vincentians promoting the novena to Our Lady of the Miraculous Medal, among others.

Yet, half way through the 20th century, the U.S. Bishops had not as a group addressed the topic of the increasing volume of the many voices of Marian devotion.
ii  Voices in the Vernacular

Very importantly, the popular mid-20th century devotional practices – the founding of American shrines, Marian parades and processions, May crowning, novenas to the Sorrowful Mother and Perpetual Help, the Family Rosary Crusade, the Sodality movement22 – were all conducted, with the approval of the Bishops, in the vernacular; that is, either in English or in the ethnic language of the city, town or neighborhood. These Marian devotions were celebrated in the language of the people, while the Church’s official prayers – the Mass and the Divine Office – were prayed in Latin:

Marian piety among Roman Catholics has been a vernacular piety. Rosaries, novenas, and Marian prayers were offered in a variety of languages while the liturgy of the pre-Vatican II worship was carried on in Latin. The growth of this Marian piety reached its height in the immediate post-World War II period and found its confirmation in the promulgation of the dogma of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin.23

It is also important to note that, for the most part, these devotions were allowed to take place during the week in the evenings, or on Saturdays or Sunday afternoons – when, in virtually all dioceses, afternoon and evening Masses were seldom allowed. The Bishops knew the working hours of their people – both urban and rural. The comfortable language and the timely availability of Marian devotions were among the principal reasons for their popularity and growth in the U.S. well into the 1950s.24

iii  European Devotions with an American accent

This hyperdulia had been carried into the arch/dioceses of the U.S. by different village-centered European immigrants and adapted to local circumstances, with the blessings of the Bishops.25

For centuries in “the old countries,” these actions, prayers, litanies and hymns had accompanied Marian practices that were shared by people and priests, expressing the needs of the faithful outside the context of the Mass. In 1950’s America, Catholic devotions were transplanted European devotions.26
Mary, the U.S. Bishops, and the Decade of Silence:

The Church in America borrowed its practices and manifestations of devotion from other lands and peoples; these Marian devotions had histories of being acceptable in the European archdioceses from which they were brought into the U.S. The American Bishops likewise accepted them in their own local Churches.

The Bishops sometimes added a unique American pitch to the tone of the various devotions. The American character of many such talks is found, by way of example, in two Discourses from the 1950’s which the Bishop of Providence, Rhode Island, gave many times throughout his diocese. The first was entitled “Mary, Model of Purity”:

I give you pictures to contemplate. One is of a girl aloft on a stage dazzling with bright colors and glittering lights, standing unblushing in indecent exposure before the gaping of sensual people. That is the world’s conception of the glorified girl…The other is the picture of the author of the Apocalypse saw in a vision: “A woman clothed with sun, and the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of 12 stars.’ And that is God’s conception of the glorified girl, Her He chose to be His mother. Which would you prefer to be?

A second talk from the pen of the same Bishop was entitled “Mary’s Greatest Fatima Miracle Still to Come”:

If in 1917 Our Blessed Mother thought it necessary to warn the godless world, how much more so now? Let us face the stark truth. We have been not only indifferent but recalcitrant…We await the great return to the fold of those who have wandered away, the great return of the God haters, when the faithful will have completely expiated their sins and those of the world.

The content was not always so fiery, but many preachers – including Bishops – used Marian imagery as a way to address forcefully individual sins and the sins of “modern times.”

The Marylike movement for modesty in women’s clothes was based on a Fatima quotation (“Certain fashions will be introduced that will offend Our Lord very much!”) and directed that “a dress cannot be called decent...
which is cut two fingers under the pit of the throat; which does not cover
the arms at least to the elbows; and scarcely reaches a bit beyond the
knees. Furthermore, dresses of transparent materials are improper.”

iv The Bishops on Building the National Shrine

In any case, the U.S. Bishops were by necessity more builders than
theologians, as Ryan pointed out, “with too little time for theological
problems.”31 In fact, the Bishops’ major Marian effort at mid-century was
not theological but architectural: a massive building project – including
fund-raising – for the completion of a National Shrine of the Immaculate
Conception in Washington D.C.

According to letters from the National Shrine’s Board of Bishops,
more than one hundred arch/dioceses agreed to hold the Shrine Appeal
during the week of Nov. 29 – Dec. 6, 1953. The remaining arch/dioceses
held the Appeal at another time, at the discretion of the Ordinary.32
Also, a ‘supplemental children’s collection” was scheduled, with an
accompanying “Handbook for Teachers”:33

The Shrine’s Board of Bishops gave a brief history of the project:

The actual construction of the Shrine, which will rank in
size among the ten largest churches in the world, was begun
in 1920. Nearly two million dollars were spent on its huge
foundations and crypt. The necessary funds (have been)
lacking to complete the superstructure…

The Shrine was left in a state of partial construction until the U.S.
Bishops took up the project in the 1950s. Representative are the records
from one diocese – Springfield in Massachusetts – that include letters
which accompanied one check for a total contribution of the people of
the Diocese of Springfield of over $110,000; another check of more than
$5,600 from the children and Sisters of the diocese; and the Bishop’s
personal check of $2,000 “to be added to those of the other Bishops of
the country for the main altar.”34

The building of the Shrine provided an example of the grass-roots level
of Marian devotion in the U.S.: in response to the Bishops’ call to “Pray
to Mary…Give for Mary’s Shrine,” women throughout the U.S. bearing
the name Mary pooled their contributions and presented to the Shrine the magnificent Mary Altar in the Crypt Church.\textsuperscript{35}

\textit{v \ The Sounds of Public Marian Observances}

Also in the 1950’s, the voices promoting devotion to Mary in the U.S. grew more widespread and hugely popular among Catholics.\textsuperscript{36} “Our Blessed Mother” – as American Catholic men, women and children called her – was very much at the heart and center of American Catholic devotion.\textsuperscript{37}

The Marian Year of 1954 – called by Pope Pius XII to commemorate the centennial of the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception\textsuperscript{38} – provided the Church in the U.S. an occasion to increase the volume of very public devotion to Mary.

Typical of the many local observances, in Seattle Archbishop Thomas Connolly directed that the Marian Year be celebrated through various devotional activities, proclaiming Mary’s great privileges:

\begin{quote}
It is my desire that you conduct a novena in your parish church beginning on Nov. 30 and closing on Dec. 8 …I am giving you this advance notice to that you might secure the services of a special preacher for the novena. The Divine Maternity of the Virgin Mary is the supreme Privilege and the font of all her other gifts and honors. It distinguishes her from all the sons of Adam and makes her pre-eminent in sanctity above all other creatures.
\end{quote}

The Archbishop ordered that

\begin{quote}
Special devotions be held in every church, every chapel, at every shrine. Let each and every family, tonight and every night, at its own hearthstone or in its parish church, kneel and recite the Rosary of Our Lady.
\end{quote}

Among the Bishops, such large well-attended public Marian observances were often the visible measure of the local Church’s vitality:
His Eminence, James Francis Cardinal McIntyre, has graciously accepted our invitation to preside and preach at our Marian Mass...at the Civic Auditorium. An overflow attendance, more than filling to capacity the 6,000 seats in the Auditorium will be a public manifestation of the affection and devotion we bear to the Mother of God. In addition, it will be a demonstration of the numerical strength of the Church in Seattle. It will prove to the prominent and distinguished guests present that the Church is a potent religious organization within this City and State. It will be a sign of unity, loyalty and devotion of the faithful to their Archbishop and their pastors.39

Similarly, in the Diocese of Lincoln, Nebraska, a Marian Rally called by Bishop James M. Casey saw “some 12,000 people – nearly one-fourth of the entire Diocese – crowded into the Pinewood Bowl for the spectacular manifestation of devotion to the Mother of God... As Bishop Casey moved among them blessing them, tears streamed unashamedly down the faces of many spectators.”40

The Bishops allowed and encouraged these public, popular Marian devotional events and, from neither a theological nor a pastoral point of view, is there record of the busy U.S. Bishops expressing any concerns about the level of the volume of Marian devotion. The Bishops seem to have agreed that “living as a minority among Protestants, many of whom look askance at manifestations of Marian piety, American Catholics have constantly been obliged to square their devotion” with the teaching of the Church, as Ryan maintained in his history of Marian devotion in the U.S. “The result is that there have been few excesses in Marian devotion.”41

vi Bishops, Marian Devotion and Politics

In the 1950’s, the swell of Marian devotions included a patriotic and sometimes political strain. The Catholic Church in the U.S. expanded from an urban, ethnic Church to a Church of the suburbs and Marian devotions also expanded from the neighborhood/parish “subculture” into the public sphere. The U.S. Bishops blessed and took part in hundreds of public Marian devotions42 which were enlisted to defend individuals, families, and nations. During that period, the Archbishop of Savannah/Atlanta preached – as did dozens of other U.S. Bishops – that “the
intercession of the Blessed Virgin will save the world.” Marian devotion was often seen as part of the Church’s criticism of modern society, especially in the era of the Cold War, when some devotional materials bluntly proclaimed that America’s destiny was linked with Mary.

In a diocesan letter calling for the “Conversion of Our Country,” Bishop Flanagan of Norwich, Conn., announced that:

> It is hereby decreed that the enclosed prayer to the Blessed Virgin Mary be recited …either after the prayers at the end of Mass or at other scheduled services, and that our people be exhorted to pray for the conversion of our country…

As the decade of the 1950’s was coming to an end, Bishop George Leech of Harrisburg, Penn., ominously pointed out – in a letter to be read at all Sunday Masses throughout the Diocese – that the occasion of the Marian feast day of “the Mother of Sorrows” was the same day as the visit of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev to the United States:

> In the Calendar of the Church, Sept. 15 is the feast of Our Mother of Sorrows. Also, it is the day the Communist Premier arrives in America, by invitation.

> This is an appropriate occasion for us to accentuate our Devotion, under God, to our free America, and our stand against oppression and persecution. On Sept. 15, therefore, I call you to our parish churches to pray: for the security of our nation, for the victims of tyranny in the captive nations, the living and the dead, and for our enemies.

> A Holy Hour will be held in every parish church and Institutional chapel. Evening Mass is hereby permitted. An appropriate discourse will be given by the priest. Our School students, elementary and secondary, will participate in this Day of Prayer.

> Our nation needs us now.

In the years of the “Cold War,” some Bishops promoted cries of supplication to Mary as prayers for the very survival of mankind:
“Fatimize or be atomized!” was a slogan often chanted by the Blue Army of Our Lady of Fatima. Thus, for many Catholic Americans – including not a few Bishops – the sentiments of Marian devotions were tied to the anti-Communist politics of the time.

vii Marian Devotion in the Secular Media

At the same time, the Bishops were well aware that images of public Marian devotion began to appear regularly in the modern media and in entertainment. In a study of secular magazines (notably *Time, Newsweek, Ladies Home Journal,* and *House and Garden*), one researcher found the 1950’s to be “very much the decade of Mary, as far as her prominence in popular periodicals is concerned.”

In his weekly television broadcast, Archbishop Fulton Sheen seldom failed to stress Mary’s protective motherhood; his show was, for a time, the most-watched program on national television.

“The Song of Bernadette” became an Oscar-winning movie about the Lourdes apparition. On the radio, Father Patrick Peyton’s “Family Rosary” was led by Hollywood stars such as Irene Dunne, Jimmy Durante, Ricardo Montalban and Pat O’Brien. And in the decade of “Disneyland,” Kenosha, Wisc., even boasted of a Marian theme park, called “Marytown”!

Summarily, in the U.S., Catholic devotion to Mary was quite loud. And while “devotional life, like other phases of life, can become exuberant,” as a priest columnist had written, “…in the faith of popular devotions, we should try the attitude of the fond mother toward her boisterous children, not that of their old maid aunt.”

Through the 1950’s, the U.S. Bishops certainly did allow the many voices of popular Marian devotion – in private, in parishes, in public – to be heard even in their exuberance.

How would the U.S. Bishops react when – with the arrival of the preparatory period for the Second Vatican Council – theologians and others attempted to temper the “mounting crescendo of Marian enthusiasm”? 
1.1c Really a “Crescendo”? The U.S. Bishops’ Expectations for the Council

i Theological Rumblings

Looking back at the 1950’s, U.S. Cardinal John Joseph Carberry included that decade “in the last hundred years and more, (which) have been frequently spoken of as ‘the age of Mary,’ as a time when Mary has blessed the world with her presence and forcefully affected the lives of many. This has been consoling.”

Donal Flanagan wrote that the years from 1950 to 1958 represented “a mounting crescendo of Marian enthusiasm.” Still another commentator noted that “the 1950’s were the heyday of Marian devotion … and then, at the very zenith of Marian enthusiasm, something happened – or rather several things happened.”

Some commentators found evidence that the Marian movement reached its apogee with 1950 and the Marian year. Tracing the Marian cult from 1854 to just before the opening of Vatican II, Mariologist Giuseppe M. Besutti, OSM, found that a great number of initiatives in this sphere had lost their vitality and relevance.

For example, Beinert maintained that even though 10,000 Marian book titles were published in the decade of the 1950’s, the treatment of the Assumption after its dogmatic definition in 1950 was minimal. Theologians were looking in other directions.

Popular Marian devotion was to varying degrees Christocentric – “to Jesus through Mary” – and the intent of the Bishops in sponsoring devotion to Mary was, of course, not to foster dedication to her in her own right but also to bring Catholics closer to Christ through His Mother. But by 1950, many Mariologists were noting that an ecclesiotypical aspect was missing in Marian theology and devotion:

The Church can study her own life in the life of Mary… The mysteries of Mary’s life are our mysteries. They reveal the pattern of our salvation in the Church whose exemplar Mary is… The theology of Mary and the Church in spite of the huge number of writings on the subject in recent years is
as yet in an unformed stage… It is not without significance that this “Age of Mary” is also the “Age of the Church” … An isolated Mariology is no longer possible. Neither is an isolated ecclesiology.⁵⁴

Nearly a century before, J.J. Newman had commented on the Eve-Mary parallels from the Patristic period of the Church and German theologians had begun to speculate on the Mary-Church relationship. Noted theologians such as Scheeben, Koster, H. Rahner, Feckes, Semmelroth, and de Lubac had written about and developed the Mary – Church correlation. H. Rahner noted that “*Mater Ecclesiae* and *Mater Christi*, ecclesiology and Mariology; these are the two ways in which so many people are drawing closer to Christ.”⁵⁵

The Mariological Society of America devoted the proceedings of its 1958 meeting in Dayton, Ohio, to the theme of “Mary and the Church.”⁵⁶ Even though the U.S. Bishops, as heads of the local *ecclesiae*, had fostered Marian devotion, such devotion was markedly not ecclesiological – even in its parochial and its very public settings – and did not necessarily lead participants to a deeper understanding of the Church. Within popular piety in the U.S., the prevalent Marian emphasis often placed her *beyond* the Church and – in some instances – perhaps beyond Christ Himself. In pluralistic American culture, this presented everyday problems:

> Perhaps all (American) Catholics have had the experience, in talking with a sincere and well-instructed Protestant about matters of religion, that before long he will inevitably bring up the question of Mariology: that he is honestly perturbed by what he considers the exaggerated role which Mary plays in Catholic doctrine and devotional life – to the neglect (he is convinced) of the unique mediatorial and redemptive role of Christ, the one Mediator between God and Man.⁵⁷

Although they did not give much voice to such disturbing experiences, more than a few of the American Bishops had encountered such problems in their arch/dioceses.

At least a few of the U.S. Bishops began to reflect on these experiences as they prepared during the early 1960s for the Second Vatican Council.
The U.S. Bishops’ Expectations – Voices Immediately Before the Council

From the U.S., 246 Bishops attended all or some part of the Council’s four sessions. Prior to the first session, 43 Americans served as members and consultans to the Council’s Preparatory commissions. Even earlier, virtually all of the U.S. Bishops had responded to the invitation to submit topics for consideration at the Council.

Yet, according to Vatican II historian Joseph Komoncak, only 39 American Bishops suggested Marian issues as possible Conciliar topics – and a handful vigorously suggested there be no new Marian teaching at the Council.

Komonchak noted that 20 U.S. Bishops asked for a dogmatic definition of one or both possible new Marian dogmas – Mediatris and/or Co-Redemptrix; further, seven U.S. Bishops asked for clarification of other Marian questions, such as her perpetual virginity; her Queenship; her role as spiritual Mother of all men; and her role as Mother of the Mystical Body.

Twelve U.S. Bishops wanted issues regarding Mary put on the Council’s agenda either for discussion or for a clearer exposition. Typical of these 12 Bishops’ concerns was Francis Cardinal Spellman’s proposal for a clearer exposition of Our Lady’s place in the economy of salvation, “lest in popular books, in fact or rather in words, the doctrine of the Blessed Virgin’s dependence on Christ be obscured.” Cardinal Spellman – unofficially recognized before the Council as the titular leader of the American hierarchy – wrote in his pre-Conciliar suggestions:

Emphasis … upon (certain Marian) teachings have occasioned some danger in that certain writings and preachings, in effect, make the work of Our Blessed Lady almost the sole instrument of salvation… They seek to imply that Our Lady’s part in the redemption of mankind was a work ex opera operato.

Komonchak reported that six U.S. Bishops explicitly requested that there be no new dogmas: Their opposition to new definitions was based primarily on ecumenical concerns:
From the primacy of the ecumenical goal, several bishops concluded that the Council should avoid new definitions of dogma. Bishop Hyland felt that this goal would be frustrated particularly in his ‘Bible Belt’ region, if there were “new” dogmas, which Protestants would surely misinterpret. Bishops Keough and Issenmann made the same point, with Bishop Sheehan adding that there would be difficulties, particularly for Anglicans, if such a new definition were even discussed so soon after the definition of the Assumption.

Bishops Hunkeler and Schulte also pointed to the ecumenical complexities of the Marian question.

According to Komonchak, the submission by Bishop Brady “pointed to the precise difficulty”:

It is not opportune further to define the prerogatives of the Blessed Virgin Mary unless the notion (false but strong) among Protestants is first uprooted that the Catholic Church has the Blessed Virgin Mary for its center and not Christ the Lord.

The relatively few and wide-ranging Marian suggestions from U.S. Bishops demonstrated that, as a group, they had no concerted plan regarding Marian topics – and many other topics – for the upcoming Council. There was little evidence of even “regional” proposals. For example, while other Bishops from Texas desired a definition of Marian titles (Bishops Garriga, Gorman, and Metzger), Bishop Nold opposed it. Some regarded such a pattern as evidence of disunity and ineffectiveness; others expressed the belief that the example of freedom of action and expression was one of the significant contributions of the U.S. hierarchy.

Nevertheless, before the Council began, whatever opinions the U.S. Bishops had about Marian topics were certainly divided.

Bishops from other parts of the world, however, seemed to have been better “organized.”
Hundreds of them requested that the role of Mary be taken up at the Council. During Vatican II’s preparatory phase, issues regarding Mary were addressed by the “Theological Commission.”

In 1960, the Central Preparatory Commission issued a list of subjects to be prepared by the Theological Commission. Concerning the Church, two subjects which the world’s Bishops had stressed equally dominated the commission’s 367 brief propositions. They were 1) a better presentation of the sacramentality of the episcopacy and its collegial nature and 2) a proper presentation of the Church’s teachings concerning the Blessed Virgin Mary.72

Three Americans served as members of the Theological Commission – Archbishop Dearden, Bishop Wright and Bishop Griffiths. Archbishop Dearden – who 10 years later would play a leading role in the U.S. Bishops’ debate over a Marian Pastoral Letter – made at least 10 trips to Rome before the Council began to take part in more than 200 meetings of the Theological Commission;73 but as the opening of the Council neared, the U.S. hierarchy demonstrated only limited, predominantly individual interest in Marian topics. The question quickly became to what extent the body of U.S. Bishops would be influenced by Bishops from other countries and other continents – and would listen to periti (expert theologians) from around the world. Before the Council, eminent theologians such as H. Rahner offered an answer:

We need to learn once again what was so treasured by the early Church – to learn to see the Church in Our Lady, and to see Our Lady in the Church.74

The Church in the U.S. had been constantly faithful and devoted to Mary. On the eve of the Second Vatican Council, the U.S. Bishops – expert Church builders, administrators, and financiers – were challenged to hear and to understand the voices of theologians who would propose a renewed ecclesiological dimension in the Church’s teaching about and devotion to Mary.
1.2 The U.S. Bishops and Mary During the Council

“In the early 60s I found myself in Rome on the fringes of the great council. Mary was there – as a sign of contradiction. I remember Cardinal Carberry. He would stop each day after the morning session to buy a flower to place at Mary’s statue. Another bishop lamented that some of his fellow hierarchs ‘sat on their hands’ when others were applauding Mary, in the course of the controversy… Mary’s place in the Church and therefore in the life of each member of the Church was viewed differently by different fathers of the council.”

1.2a U.S. Bishops Hear the “Periti”

Of the 2205 spoken interventions delivered by all the Council Fathers at Vatican II, only 118 spoken interventions were delivered by U.S. Bishops. Yzermans wrote that

The American Bishops’ reluctance to speak, if it can be called reluctance, is best explained by the American character itself. An American prefers action to speech. He finds it embarrassing to create tedium by voicing views which another has already expressed. This national temperament had restrained more than one American bishop from addressing the Council assembly.

Meanwhile, however, the U.S. Bishops were indeed listening to the opinions and experiences of other Bishops from around the world. One American prelate observed that

One factor which (influenced us) was the fact that a goodly number of Latin American Bishops have become frightened by the fact that a great many of their people have little religion left except a distorted form of a cult of the Blessed Mother which in many cases is material, if not formal, idolatry. They wanted to get the devotion to Our Lady into its proper perspective.

Such theological considerations – with accompanying pastoral implications – were paramount in the minds of some Council Fathers as
they prepared to debate and vote on a proposal to incorporate a then-separate schema on Mary\textsuperscript{78} into the larger schema on the Church.

The “opposing sides” were defined somewhat simplistically by Father Gustave Weigel, SJ, at a session of the U.S. Bishops’ Press Panel when he pointed out “two tendencies in the Marian movement of the day.” The U.S. theologian said there were “the ‘maximalists’ who wanted to say all they could about the Blessed Virgin and consequently stressed her importance. There were also the ‘minimalists’ who want to stick to Scripture and Tradition and say no more.”\textsuperscript{79}

The differentiation between ‘minimalists” and “maximalists” given by Abbe Rene Laurentin was more nuanced and insightful:

*Maximizing* tendencies in Mariology would needlessly bring about the promotion or dogmatization of new formulas which undue haste would render inexact … Mary is seen as prior to and superior to the Church … superior and outside the Church. This is a juridical point of view.

A minimizing nature, which some considered to be a dishonor to the Blessed Virgin … considers Mary an eminent and outstanding member of Church … superior and within. This is an organic and functional point of view.\textsuperscript{80}

Laurentin further considered the forces behind this uneasy conflict over Marian questions and delineated seven “movements” of aggiornamento in the Church – movements which, on the one hand, seemed to threaten traditional Mariology but, on the other hand, offered Mariology a renewed integrity and depth.\textsuperscript{81}

The theological conflicts over the place of Mary were explained during an important presentation made to the U.S. Bishops at the North American College on the evening of Oct. 28, 1963 – the day before the Council Fathers’ vote for or against inclusion of the Marian schema in the schema on the Church.

According to a report by Father T. William Coyle, C.Ss.R.\textsuperscript{82}, Cardinal Meyer of Chicago – who had emerged as “the reluctant” leader of the American hierarchy \textsuperscript{83} – asked Father Ahern to address a meeting of the
U.S. Bishops at the North American College. Father Barnabas Ahern\textsuperscript{84} in turn asked Father Eugene Maly\textsuperscript{85}, Father Godfrey Diekmann, O.S. B.\textsuperscript{86} and Father Coyle to constitute the panel along with himself.

Although the U.S. Bishops had decades of experience working together at home in their national conference, it was not until October 1963 that they all gathered with a group of American theologians during the Council. From the very beginning of the preparatory phase it was evident that Bishops of some countries had decided to follow a single line. In some circles there was apprehension that the American bishops would take advantage of their numbers and, some feared, their munificence to Bishops in other countries to develop a strong bloc of voices and votes.\textsuperscript{87} This had not begun to happen – until late October 1963.

Father Coyle reported 25 years later to the Mariological Society of America: Father Ahern, Father Maly, Father Diekmann and myself … met for lunch on Oct. 24 to divide the material: Father Ahern on the general background of the schema and the Old Testament; Father Maly on the New Testament; Father Diekmann on the Fathers and tradition; myself, on the teaching of the theologians. We agreed that we would urge the rejection of the current schema on the Church, because of some of the shortcomings of the present schema which could be more easily modified if the document was going to be entirely re-worked to fit into the Church schema, rather than just a piecemeal amending of the text.\textsuperscript{88}

Elsewhere, Father Coyle wrote that “our panel recommended (discreetly, as always) the direction for the vote.”\textsuperscript{89}

At 5 p.m. on Oct. 28, the four priests were allowed into the weekly meeting of the American Bishops. According to plan, they made their four presentations\textsuperscript{90} and prepared to stay for a brief questions/answers session – which expanded to 40 minutes. As the four priests made ready to leave, Bishop Carberry (then of Lafayette, Ind.), stood and pronounced: “These talks are some of the best we have heard during almost two years of the Council. I would like to ask the Fathers to make copies available to all of us.” His remark was followed by the Bishops’ applause.
Bishop Walter Curtis of Bridgeport remarked, “We should have done this two years ago. We have a lot of ground to make up in a short time,” and Archbishop Leo Binz of St. Paul – Minneapolis said, “That was the most impressive panel discussion I have ever seen in any field in my entire life.”

The reporter Michael Novak noted at the time that “four American experts had addressed the American Bishops at their weekly meeting … These talks, and the men who gave them, made such an impression on the American Bishops that afterward many of the latter told the scholars that they now intended to vote for the inclusion of the treatment on Mary in the schema on the Church.”

The meeting was the first of many between the U.S. Bishops and theologians during the remaining sessions of the Council.

Dom Christopher Butler, abbot of Downside Abbey, held a press conference the same week. He said that two tendencies in Catholic teaching on Mary were coming to a parting of the ways.

It remains to be seen what route the Council will follow. Its members, it may be said, are unanimous in their desire to do honor to Christ by honoring His mother. The question is, which of the two ways now open will win the support of the majority of the Council members as best tending to realize its desire.

For the Marian question, the votes of the U.S. Bishops at the Council would prove to be crucial.

1.2b The Bishops’ Vote: “Stunned Silence”

Thus, on Oct. 29, 1963, one of the great emotional issues at the Council came to a boil. Among the Council observers and correspondents as well as the Council Fathers themselves, there was considerable excitement on the day of the vote. “The atmosphere outside the basilica reminded one of a political convention … and the conduct of some of the Bishops and theologians approached that level.”
As for the U.S. Bishops, “the Council Fathers soon realized that our Bishops could and did act in concert and also individually.”

Monsignor Gerard Philips observed that the general mood was anything but dispassionate. Two distinguished Cardinals had made presentations, representing deux tendances en mariologie. Rufino Cardinal Santos, Archbishop of Manila, argued that Mary’s special dignity demanded a special recognition. Among his clearly stated reasons:

> The dignity of the Mother of God and her role in the divine economy of salvation deserve to be given special treatment, and not to be simply inserted into an already long schema on the Church, or put into a brief appendix, as if it were something of only secondary importance. Nor should it be forgotten that cutting down this schema on the Blessed Virgin Mary, which was already announced and after approval by the coordinating commission, would cause wonderment and might be interpreted as a lessening of the honor due to the Blessed Virgin, and would also call attention to controversies existing among Catholics which seem imprudent.

Following Cardinal Santos’ presentation, there was moderate applause among the Council Fathers.

Franz Cardinal Koenig of Vienna argued in favor of combining the schemas. His reasoning was both theological and devotional, but perhaps his most cogent reason was pastoral:

> A pastoral consideration is that this method of treatment would help to instruct the faithful correctly on the mystery of the Incarnation and the part played by the Blessed Virgin therein. Popular devotion needs to be guided and directed lest it neglect essentials and get lost in secondary and accidental things. This is why, not rarely, devotion to the Blessed Virgin is separated from the mystery of Christ and His Church. Thus, our Mariological teaching should not stand out as something separate, but as a teaching united with the Church. The result will be an enrichment of both doctrines.
The feeling in the Council hall was that Koenig had been “more precise, more nuanced. He received more prolonged applause.”

Meanwhile, according to published reports, Romans were speculating wildly, as only Romans could, about the outcome. It was known that a number of individual Bishops, as well as several delegations of Bishops from particular countries – in their anxiety over developments – had gone to see the Pope to ask him to intervene. The impending vote had become the occasion for “an extraordinary and intensive propaganda barrage on behalf of a separate schema on the Virgin Mary. Propaganda for the separate schema was so intensive as to startle many of the Bishops; many of the Bishops were scandalized. A pamphlet some attributed to Father Balic tried to make the Bishops believe that the forthcoming vote was a matter of taking sides ‘for’ or ‘against’ Mary.”

“Indeed, what if the vote on Mary split the Council in two?”

Finally, in the uncertain and uneasy atmosphere of the Vatican basilica, the question was officially put to the Council Fathers by the day’s moderator, Gregorio Cardinal Agagianian:

Is it your pleasure to adopt the schema on the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of the Church, in such a manner that it may become the last chapter of the schema De Ecclesia?

N.B. A placet vote means that the schema on the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of the Church, will become the last chapter of the schema on the Church. A non placet vote means that the schema on the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of the Church is to remain separate.

The total number of Bishops voting was 2,193, meaning 1,097 votes were needed for a simple majority. The announced result was that 1,114 Bishops voted for the unification of the schemas on the Blessed Virgin and on the Church, while 1,074 voted for the composition of two separate schemas.

The motion received only 17 votes more than the needed majority. It was widely known that just the night before, the U.S. Bishops had – for the most part – changed their minds. Archbishop Lawrence Sheehan
of Baltimore\textsuperscript{105} wrote that “as a result of (the theologians’) talks and the discussion that followed, most of us were convinced that it (the doctrine on Mary) should be included in the Constitution on the Church.” There was little doubt that “the presentations by the theologians had brought about a shift of more than 20 votes on the part of the American Bishops.”\textsuperscript{106}

An unidentified U.S. Bishop revealed to a commentator:

Another factor in the successful vote was the excellent job done by the panel at the meeting of the U.S. Bishops yesterday afternoon. I am convinced that a number of the U.S. Bishops would have voted with the conservatives if they had not had the benefit of the presentation made by this panel on the subject of Mariology. A switch of only 20 votes would have defeated the project. I feel quite sure that at least 20 votes of the U.S. Bishops were switched as a result of that meeting.”\textsuperscript{107}

The U.S. Bishops’ consideration of Mary at the Council had reached the doctrinal level at the critical moment in the development of the Council’s Mariology. Additionally, their combined voices had been the deciding difference in determining the direction which the Council would follow. As Father Coyle remembered:

Archbishop Binz shook my hand at the Bar Jonah coffee bar and said, “Congratulations, Bill. You won the election.”\textsuperscript{108}

Yet after the vote was announced, there was none of the usual applause, only a “stunned silence, a moment of dazed amazement.”\textsuperscript{109} Rene Laurentin reported that “(it) was sorrowful, and there were tears.”\textsuperscript{110}

The silence inside the Council hall and the confusion that would be expressed among the press and the people outside were to be foreshadowings for the U.S. Bishops of problems at home in the decade that followed.
1.2c World-wide Echoes: Interpretations by the Press and Theologians

At the time of the crucial vote, Laurentin reported that “the Marian question was much publicized; but, unfortunately, it was also grossly misinterpreted.” This was particularly true of much of the press. Questionable theological opinions added to the confusion.

An Oct. 30, 1963 story in *The New York Herald Tribune* was a typical example of the U.S. secular press’ interpretation of “the Marian question”:

> After days of intense lobbying, which went as far as distributing pamphlets on the steps of St. Peter’s Basilica, the Vatican Council moved today to de-emphasize the place of the Virgin Mary in the Church.

> On its face, the vote was procedural. The fathers agreed by a slim majority of 40 that a chapter on the Virgin Mary should be included in the Schema on the Church.

> Behind the vote is the Council’s deep division on the issue, with two different conceptions of Mary’s role in the Church.

> One, called the maximalist, insists on giving the utmost possible Devotion to Mary and associating her in the Mystery of Redemption.

> The minimalists stick to scripture and view Mary as the most perfect member of the Church, but insist that she not be venerated separately.

According to Sando Magister, long-time Vatican reporter, “this language was quickly taken on by the majority of the press. However, this language was not just descriptive; it was prescriptive. Any sensitive and modern person reading the press reports was ‘obliged’ to side with the progressives.”

For instance, in the face of assurances that the Council Fathers’ vote would not be a reflection on the Church’s love and devotion for the
Virgin, the *Herald Tribune’s* story led off with the report that the Bishops had decided to “de-emphasize the place of ... Mary.”

Today’s vote was felt by experts and Council fathers to be a narrow victory for the minimalists and for the Christian unity movement. Stressing devotion to Mary is criticized by Protestant and Orthodox Churches alike.114


> When the voting was over it was clear that all the urgent lobbying on the steps of St. Peter’s and the telephone campaigns that had kept Vatican switchboards busy all week had just been for show... An English priest said: “If we take her outside the church schema and give her separate treatment, we could do great damage in our relations with our separated brethren, the other Christians.”

The Rev. Gustave Weigel, the American Jesuit scholar ... argued that some Catholics would have “the blessed Virgin Mary the fourth person of the Holy Trinity.”

Protestant theologian Karl Barth wrote that “the greatest obstacle to rapprochement between the reformed church and the Catholic Church is a tiny little word which the Roman Church adds after each of our statements: the word ‘and.’ When we say ‘Jesus,’ the Catholics say ‘Jesus and Mary.’ Baptist scholar Harvey Cox also has complained about ‘the tendency toward twin deities.’”117

The U.S. Bishops attempted to counter the errors of the popular press. At the American Bishops’ Press Panel118 held after the voting, Father Bernard Haering, C.Ss.R. said that there were two predominant reasons motivating those who, in the minority, voted against making the schema on Our Lady part of the schema on the Church:
Some of the Fathers did not want the matter of Our Lady to be treated at all, mostly for reasons of ecumenism. Others, and the greater part, felt that if a special place was not given to the Blessed Virgin in a separate schema, her glory would be diminished.

Father Haering pointed out that the question was not simply a matter of “maximalists” or “minimalists,” but a question of good doctrine:

> It is a question of expressing the fullness of the doctrine as far as it enters into the balanced perspective of the Church and presents the veneration of Mary in its proper relation to the adoration of Christ.119

Nevertheless, “Council votes to downgrade Mary” is the way the headlines of most stories ran.120 From these reports in the secular press, many people in the general public got the impression that a battle for and against Our Lady had broken out in the Council. “Even some Catholics were misled into thinking that such a struggle had ensued and that the ‘enemies’ of Our Lady had emerged victors. That, of course, is not true.”121

Bernard Cardinal Alfrink of Utrecht concluded that much confusion over the schema on Mary stemmed from confusion over the document’s purpose, which was doctrinal rather than devotional. The task of the Council, he maintained, was to determine what is taught and not what is thought. In this regard, he continued, the Fathers were to recall that the conciliar decree would be binding and that there was no question of stating “too much” or “too little,” but only of stating what was true.122

Nevertheless, even 40 years later, the theologian Elizabeth Johnson described the events of Oct. 29, 1963 in almost mythic proportions:

> My own view is that what happened was a kind of seismic upheaval in which the strained, bulging theological earth shifted back to realignment with the pattern of the first millennium.123
1.2d  **Echoes One Year Later – Final Vote and “Mother of the Church”**

During the year after the vote in which the U.S. Bishops played such a prominent role, the Council fathers and the periti produced *Lumen Gentium*, which was actually a Constitution on the Church containing another constitution within it. By the time of the Council’s final vote on Chapter 8 – entitled “The Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God in the Mystery of Christ and the Church” – many of the arguments of the previous year had been somewhat soothed.

Some moderate debate was voiced regarding the Marian chapter in *Lumen Gentium*; most points of the debate were raised by non-Americans.

Archbishop Jaeger argued that the text should make it clear that Mary, like the Church, is animated and vivified by the Holy Spirit who dwells in her as in a noble temple. Cardinal Suenens stressed that from a doctrinal point of view, the schema said too little, the text being too prudent and timid, placing insufficient stress on the deep link between Mary and the work of Christ.

From among the U.S. Bishops, Auxiliary Bishop John Whealon of Cleveland, together with the Bishops of Indonesia, some French Bishops and others, stated that the term “Mediatrix of Graces” should be removed from the schema. New York’s Cardinal Spellman praised the revised schema overall, because “Catholics as well as non-Catholics justly and deservedly await a clear word on what the Catholic Church as such really believes, holds and teaches concerning the tribute, privileges and cult of Mary.”

Earlier, Philadelphia’s Archbishop Krol had submitted that the title “Mother of the Church” should be replaced with “Mother of the Redeemer” which seems to express better the essential position of Mary in the economy of salvation, while at the same time it contains the meaning of the other prerogatives which follow that position.

On the other hand, Cardinal Wyszynski, speaking in the name of all 70 Bishops of Poland, announced that the Polish Bishops had asked Pope Paul VI to make official acknowledgement of the spiritual motherhood of
Mary for all men. They also wanted the Council to call Mary “the Mother of the Church.” He stated that the Polish people attributed their tenacity in keeping the Faith to devotion to Mary.\(^{129}\)

Interestingly – and not without consequences years later – the Polish Cardinal Karol Wojtyla submitted a lengthy written intervention “in the name of the Polish episcopate” on Mary’s place in the proposed Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, and added a personal written intervention arguing that the chapter on Mary should not become the document’s last chapter but should immediately follow its first, on “The Mystery of the Church.” He maintained that, as Mary had nourished Christ’s body as his earthly mother, so she continued to nourish the Mystical Body of Christ.\(^{130}\)

On Oct. 29, 1964, the council Fathers passed the chapter on Mary by an ample majority. A total of 1,559 Fathers voted their unqualified approval; there were only 10 “no” votes. However, in light of both the close vote one year earlier and the more recent interventions – 521 Fathers voted approval “with qualification,” that is, approval with some changes to be made. One vote was null.\(^{131}\)

Then suddenly, the final aspect of “Marian controversy” at Vatican II came to the fore. It grew out of the debate and discussions which had begun in the preparatory phase and continued throughout the years of the Conciliar sessions:

Chapter VIII with its own five “chapters” sought to place Mary, the mother of Jesus, in her proper context among the People of God. She is so unique that this was not easy to do. Moreover, she is our mother, and it was difficult to keep things fully in perspective when one spoke about one’s mother.\(^{132}\)

Almost as if to offset the Council’s decision not to generate a statement solely about Mary, Pope Paul VI surprisingly gave her the title “Mother of the Church.”\(^{133}\)

Paul VI would have liked the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council themselves to have proclaimed “Mary ‘Mother of the Church,’ that is, of the whole people of God, of the faithful and their Pastors.” The Pope
made the proclamation himself in his speech at the end of the Council’s third session on Nov. 21, 1964, also asking that “henceforth the Blessed Virgin be honoured and invoked with this title by all Christian people.” Despite the reservations of some Council Fathers, the Pope – acting on the petition of the Polish Bishops who were supported by the Vietnamese Bishops – gave Mary the title.

To some, the seemingly harmless title “Mother of the Church” became a symbol of the pains involved in the birth of a new form of the Church. Of such a Church, they contended, “Mary can only be a daughter.” Furthermore, some Protestant and even a few Catholic commentators charged that Pope Paul had offended against the doctrine of collegiality. U. S. Lutheran theologian and invited Council observer Martin E. Marty asked “since (the bishops) had chosen deliberately not to bestow this title on Mary, why did he … act against collegiality?” and the American Catholic commentator Michael Novak rebuked the Pope for “his use of the title after the Council had specifically rejected it.” In the New Yorker, Xavier Rhynne called it “a final disappointment awaiting the Bishops.”

Among the U.S. Bishops’ responses, Cardinal E. Joseph Ritter’s Saint Louis Review voiced the complaints of certain Bishops and periti in telling its readers that “the granting of the title, ‘Mother of the Church,’ to Mary by the Pope’s words on Saturday was in direct contradiction to the will of the majority of the Fathers.” It is doubtful that such a statement could have been printed in an American Bishop’s own diocesan newspaper without his consent and his approval.

In any case, some contended that Pope Paul had only made explicit something which the chapter said implicitly, but there was a newfound theological keenness among the U.S. Bishops:

Just as Americans here have influenced the council, the council has influenced these Americans. It has instilled in the American Bishops and priests here an alertness toward theology that they have never had before. It has quickened their awareness of their common heritage. It has enhanced their sense of a common mission in the U.S.
Nevertheless, as Laurentin stated, at Vatican II the Marian question caused great difficulty and had not been resolved by the time of the Council’s end.\textsuperscript{144} Paul VI felt well the problem of a difficult transition between the Marian movement – even with its polarization and excesses – and the worry of ecclesiological and ecumenical integration which risked reducing Mary and extinguishing fervor.

“It was a real problem. The post-Conciliar period proved it.”\textsuperscript{145}

1.3 The U.S. Bishops and Mary After the Council

“Today…so many Christians have expressed confusion about the role of Mary in the economy of salvation and her role in the Church…”\textsuperscript{146}

1.3a Effects of Vatican II Theology on Marian Devotion: A Confusion of Voices

Inarguably, the period immediately after the end of Vatican II saw the appearance of tensions and contradictions in the Church, “especially in regard to the obligations of religious practice and traditional observances.”\textsuperscript{147}

Anecdotally, the Dominican Matthew F. Morry noted:

Students in a parochial school heard their teacher scoff at the idea of learning to recite the Rosary of Mary. Parishioners were startled to hear a priest advise them to make their Marian devotions at home. Some young people, upon being questioned, made the response that they never even think of Mary, let alone pray for her help.\textsuperscript{148}

Assessing the situation of Marian devotion, Dan Herr coined the phrase “piety void.”\textsuperscript{149}

To say that Marian devotions had fallen to a low point would be an understatement. The fact was, Father Morry contended, that “Mary and all that pertains to her have been relegated to the shadows and fringes of renewal in the Church.”\textsuperscript{150}
A change of some sort was inevitable. Because of the Council’s teaching on Mary, Marian devotion “in particular, seemed to call for urgent consideration.”151 After all, devotion is the connatural response of the Church and its members to the doctrinal truths concerning the Blessed Virgin.152 The development of the Church’s teaching about both the Sacred Liturgy (Sacrosanctum Concilium) and Mary (Lumen Gentium Chapter 8) predicated a development in devotion.

As early as the 1940’s, the distinction between liturgy and “popular devotions” had begun. In Pius XII’s encyclical Mediator Dei (1947),

Liturgy was defined as the “public worship of the Church carried out by its official ministers,” which included the Mass, the sacraments and the Divine Office. All other prayers and ceremonies of Catholic life – not enumerated, but which included the Rosary, litanies, Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, Stations of the Cross, pilgrimages – all fell under the category of “devotional exercises” and “pious practices.”153

In fact, the Council in its teachings said little about Marian devotion; it spoke much more about liturgy:

Vatican II’s first document, that on the liturgy, spoke much of the matters directed related to the Mass, the sacraments, the liturgical books and the liturgical calendar. In the words of the Council, the liturgy was “the summit toward which the activity of the Church is directed and the font from which all its power flows” (Sacrosanctum Concilium, 10). Little was said about those expressions of devotion which were not strictly speaking liturgical (no reference was made, for example, to the rosary.) The council only directed that “pious exercises should be drawn up so that they harmonize with the liturgical seasons, accord with the sacred liturgy, are in some way derived from it and lead the people to it, since in fact the liturgy by its very nature is far superior to them.” (SC, 13).154

Devotions would rightly be analyzed “following the study of Sacred Scripture, the holy Fathers, the doctors and liturgy of the Church, and under the guidance of the magisterium.”155
Mary, the U.S. Bishops, and the Decade of Silence:

The confusion in the years after the Council grew out of the difficult task of implementing the call for a new relationship of popular devotion to the liturgy:

Because of the superior position which the council assigned to the liturgy vis-à-vis popular devotion, the advocates of the liturgy sometimes displayed a condescending attitude toward popular devotion, practices to be tolerated but not encouraged. Those associated with popular devotions, not understanding how to undertake the reform called for by the council, generally resisted challenging them.156

In addition to the prominent place given to liturgical studies, there were other theological reasons – likewise complex – for the period of decline in devotion to Mary. In light of modern Biblical studies, for example, “popularization of the findings of strict biblical exegesis led to insecurity in preachers who felt that their former use of the scriptures might not be legitimate.”157 Additionally, the Church’s main energies were concentrated on institutional renewal and on ecumenism far more than on the devotional life.

It was, therefore, easy for some to feel that Catholics had put Mary in the back of the drawer for awhile; devotion to her seemed to be superstitious and non-ecumenical to many.158 For among the changes that the Council’s new openness to the world least permitted was the criticism and decline of many traditional forms of personal piety.159

Upon their return to the United States, the American Bishops played various roles in the implementation of Conciliar teaching in their arch/dioceses.

A keen historian would readily admit the sometimes dominant, sometimes permissive and sometimes reluctant role played by the American Bishops in the transportation of aggiornamento to American shores.160

Cardinal Ritter of St. Louis — whose newspaper publicly disagreed with the Pope’s pronunciation of Mary as “Mother of the Church” — died less than two years after the end of the Council. His Vatican-appointed
replacement was a Bishop known for the volume of his Marian devotion – John J. Carberry, who noted that

what amazed us (Bishops) most was returning home to our Dioceses and archdioceses at the end of each of the Council’s Sessions, and discovering what was being done “in the name of the Council” or “in the spirit of Vatican II” – and none of it had truly come out of the Council!161

He was among the few U.S. Bishops who wrote or spoke publicly in response to the confusion about devotion to Mary. Even before the Council had ended, Bishop James E. Kearney of the Diocese of Rochester, New York addressed a brief but strongly-worded letter to his people, noting the confusion and attributing its cause to “extremism”:

We know only too well that the “opening of the windows,” as Pope John expressed it, has had some weird results. What concerns us especially is the danger of injuring the traditional sturdy confidence of our people in their faith. Extreme ecumenical writers…extreme modern theologians… extreme liturgists ask us to minimize devotion to Mary and the Saints.162

Without any further theological, ecumenical, biblical or liturgical explanation, Bishop Kearney went on to “dedicate this year 1965 to Mary, the Mother of the Church.”

Within a year after the Council’s close, Archbishop James Byrne of Dubuque, Iowa gave lengthy talks entitled “Devotion to Mary, the Mother of God” throughout his archdiocese and in other Midwestern dioceses. He noted “some modern errors about Our Blessed Mother, including a) talk about de-emphasizing Mary…b) efforts to minimize Marian practices…and c) that sometimes priests or religious were involved in spreading such errors.” He listed some causes:

Erroneous, rash writing or talks…disturbance or upset originating in other areas, e.g. obedience, spreading to Marian thinking and practices … psychological reasons such as conscious or unconscious resentment to one’s mother or to
all authority … Guilt feelings (leading to) attacks on Marian devotion because Mary is sinless, obedient, etc. 163

Yet most of Archbishop Byrne’s lengthy talks dealt with a thorough presentation of *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII, concluding with a call for the implementation of the Conciliar teaching which admonishes all the sons of the Church that the cult, especially the liturgical cult, of the Blessed Virgin be generously fostered, and the practices and exercises of piety, recommended by the magisterium of the Church toward her in the course of the centuries be made of great moment (*LG*, no. 67).

During this Marian “crisis,” theologians openly disputed the place of devotion to Mary in the Church. Advice about the proper place of devotions was ubiquitous in the Catholic press in the years before and after Vatican II. 164 Ernest Lussier, S.S.S. wrote in *Chicago Studies*:

> Some are wondering whether Marian devotion is not secondary or even accessory in Christianity, if not actually superfluous and to a certain extent artificial … There are certain practices of Marian devotion that border on superstition … Sentimentalism is another reproach often directed against devotion to the Blessed Virgin … Infantilism takes the form of an excessively sentimental and not sufficiently dogmatic presentation of Mary’s divine maternity … One encounters in some Marian devotion a kind of idolatry… 165

> “Among progressive Catholics,” posited Andrew Greeley, “Marian devotion became virtually nonexistent.” 166

According to The Marian Library Newsletter, “the ‘eclipse of popular devotion’ which followed Vatican II was perhaps more responsible for the ‘Marian crisis’ than the placement of the Virgin Mary in the eighth chapter of *Lumen Gentium.*” 167 Yet the popular Catholic periodical *America* would maintain, even after several decades, that “the relative disappearance of Mary from public view is, we are told, consistent with the ‘intentions of Vatican II.’” 168
A similar lack of historical perspective was to be seen after the Councils of Chalcedon and Trent.\textsuperscript{169} Although other councils had been followed by troubled periods, even alert observers thought that this Council would be spared what E.E.Y. Hales described as the “devil’s work.”\textsuperscript{170}

Such was not to be the case.

\textbf{1.3b The Effects of the Societal Explosions of the 1960’s}

Every council has been profoundly marked by its environment and by the kinds of questions raised at the time.\textsuperscript{171} Examining the post-Conciliar period, Bishop James Malone of Youngstown, Ohio, pointed out:

```
Whatever one might think of the negative factors in U.S. Catholicism after the Council, the Council itself is not to be blamed for them. Rather, cultural factors originating outside the Catholic Church account for many recent problems of Catholic life in the U.S. as in many other countries.\textsuperscript{172}
```

His point was supported outside the U.S. by the Dutch Bishops who emphasized that one must not confuse post hoc with propter hoc: what happened after the Council was not necessarily the result of the Council. “The Church reflected the pressures and the movements of the world… (especially) a wide-ranging secularization.”\textsuperscript{173}

Also in retrospect, Walter Cardinal Kasper conceded that the Church underwent many difficulties after Vatican II. But he denied that they were caused by the Council:

```
The years 1965–85 in Western Europe and North America (Kasper, a careful scholar, pleads ignorance of the rest of the world) coincided with a kind of cultural revolution which led to a break with tradition, a crisis of authority, an indifference toward questions of faith, great uncertainty about moral values, and a crisis in the realm of ethics.
```
Kasper remarked that these pressures were felt within the Church, not surprisingly, since the Church can never be hermetically sealed off from the “world.”

Also 20 years after the Council, Godfreed Cardinal Daneels addressed a “secularization” not completely traceable to the Council which resulted in the abandonment of religious life and priestly ministry; drying up of vocations; rarity of individual confessions; break-up of marriages – The liberty of the children of God, much trumpeted in the Post-Conciliar period, has sometimes been turned into “an Individualistic liberalism and a somewhat anarchic creativity.”

Focusing specifically on the Church in the U.S. and on the changes in devotional life, Robert A. Orsi listed the following reasons for the disappearance of some forms of devotion:

- The issue of the relationship between the present and the past – of who we are now in relation to who we were then – pressed itself with particular urgency upon Catholics in the U.S. in the 1960’s.

- The old inner-city enclaves were disappearing as increasingly prosperous and middle-class Catholics moved to the suburbs.

- The great migration of African Americans and Puerto Ricans into the Catholic strongholds of industrial northern cities further transformed the life and look of the old streets.

- Lay Catholics were better educated than ever before, the result in part of the GI bill.

- The relationships between generations within immigrant working-class families became very complicated, as did the relationships between priests and nuns, on the one hand, and the “new layman and lay woman” on the other.
Orsi clearly articulated that “the name usually given to change in this period among Catholics is ‘the Second Vatican Council’ or ‘Vatican Two,’ but this is not adequate.

The disappearance of the rosary as communal prayer, the introduction of the vernacular Mass, and the rethinking of the theology of the Church and of religious life (including redesign of religious garb) – all took place in a community undergoing wide and revolutionary transformations in life ways. It is impossible to separate social and religious change in these years.”

Addressing “Marian devotion in the United States” after the Council, the Rev. Donald G. Dawe noted one great societal change that affected Marian piety – the dispersal of the great ethnic communities in American cities to the suburbs. While there were still glorious Marian festivals in the ethnic neighborhoods of the great cities, these forms of popular religion became much less influential in the new suburban developments of American urban life.

Other causes – not directly linked to the Council – surely included an apathetic quiet toward religion and religious practices, the voices of the feminist movement, the sounds of war, protest and assassination, and the 1960’s cries for revolution.

The so-called “American character” also had some influence on the diminishment of Marian devotion after the Council. “In the United States, religious individualism is a constant temptation,” wrote Cardinal Dulles. This individualism has sometimes been coupled with what the great American sociologist Seymour Martin Lipset called “the two core American values: ‘equality’ and ‘achievement.’ Americans want a level playing field and don’t like people who put on airs.” M. Basil Pennington added that “we Americans are very much equalizers. We have to be careful that we are not just trying to bring Mary down to our level, so to speak.”

In “The Situation after Vatican II,” Giuseppe Alberigo noted that in the years following the Council, “the Church set out anew to seek in freedom the Lord who always goes on before His disciples. Nothing could be more diametrically opposed to this new quest than the itch for novelty, a mundane optimism, or indifference to tradition.” Nevertheless,
the post-conciliar explosion manifested itself in ... the shockingly sudden disappearance of forms of Marian piety which were characteristics of Catholic prayer life. In hindsight it is not so astonishing that the unrest which was seething beneath the surface seized the occasion to manifest itself in exactly that aspect of Catholic life and piety which was so prominent as to be the accepted mark of a Catholic in American society – devotion to the saints, especially St. Mary!\(^{182}\)

**1.3c The Silence about Mary**

Wolfgang Beinert was among those who acknowledged that following the Council “it (was) surprising that Conciliar (teaching about Mary) found no answering echo in the Church. Mariology and Marian devotion were disturbingly close to nil. The choral praise of God’s Mother – so strong in the days of Pius XII – has been succeeded by a deep silence.”\(^{183}\)

The years after the Council, according to Avery Cardinal Dulles, have been called “a decade without Mary.”\(^{184}\) Even though Paul VI said in 1967, “Our era may well be called ‘the Marian era’ because every age of the Church has been and is ‘a Marian era’”\(^{185}\), by 1970 the Pope was lamenting:

> It has come to pass, among so many spiritual upsets, this also: the devotion to the Blessed Virgin no longer finds, as in former times, our spirits as well disposed, inclined and happy to profess it from the bottom of our hearts.\(^{186}\)

Among even the world’s Bishops, the number of Pastoral Letters on Mary shrank to almost nil. According to the annual *Lettere Pastorali* published by Magistero Episcopale in Verona:

- From 1960–63, the section on “Maria Santissima” was usually 3 pages in length and listed 30 to 40 Pastoral Letters on Mary;

- In 1964 and 1965, the section (re-titled “Maria Santissima nel Mistero di Christo e della Chiesa”) listed a sudden drop to only three Pastoral Letters each year;
• In 1966 and 1967, the topic of Mary entirely disappeared from the index;

• In 1968, the annual included a very brief Letter from the Bishops of Holland and in 1969, Cardinal Suenens’ Maria voluta da Dio;

• By 1970 and 1971, there were four times as many letters on “Marxismo” than on “Maria.”

Alongside this lack of episcopal writing, once-popular Marian publications were rapidly losing subscribers by 1970; furthermore,

Preachers avoid(ed) the topic of Mary as a model of women and indeed (said) very little about Mary. For some the topic of Mary became an embarrassment, for others it proved simply boring.

After the Council, the memory of Mary was neglected by “the embarrassed silence of preachers and teachers, this most of all.”

Father Eamon R. Carroll, O.Carm., has recalled an insight of the well-known Father Alfred Boeddeker, O.F.M., Director of the Franciscan Marian Center in San Francisco:

Father Boeddeker pointed out that he was a native German speaker. He grew up in the San Francisco area, but spoke German at home as a child. So he had very good German context, and he said that Hitler’s plan, with respect to Christianity, was “Wir schweigen ihn in den Tod” or “We’ll silence him to death” – that is, we’ll say nothing about Christ!

In very similar words, Karl Rahner commented during the post-Conciliar decade that “some of our Catholic doctrines are in danger of being silenced to death.” According to Father Carroll, that phrase – “silenced to death” – indicated “both the Nazi approach to Christianity and the condition of Marian teaching and preaching after the Council.”
The “silence” of the decade was not universally lamented. Father Hans Kung, who according to Dulles “applauded and abetted this Marian recession”\(^\text{194}\), observed:

> After the Council, it (was) not surprising that, apart from publications of a few specialists, theological books and articles on Mary became rarities; even in the Roman Catholic Church it looked as though the broad river of Mariology was going to dry up.\(^\text{195}\)

Kung, among others, censured recent Popes for having promoted Marian devotion by every means. He praised Vatican II for having integrated Mariology into the last chapter on the Church and for having “unmistakably condemned the excesses of Marianism.”

> “Since the Council,” he declared, “this exaggerated Marian cult had completely lost its force both in theology and in the life of the Church.”\(^\text{196}\)

This “loss” was straight-forwardly acknowledged by the American Jesuit Walter Burghardt:

> In our rough and tumble 1960’s, what happened to Our Lady? Put bluntly, we lost her. Not only American Catholics at large, but unnumbered religious as well. The reasons were complex; the result was patent: Mary faded into the background of Catholic devotion… “Lovely lady dressed in blue” became a fun line for sophisticates…\(^\text{197}\)

One could say that devotion to Mary simply became risible. Yet others saw the loss of devotion as part of a broader crisis in faith:

> Devotion to the Blessed Virgin has become a sore subject in Christian spirituality today… At a time when the essentials of religion are so widely forgotten, our masses dead, our sacraments closed in, when scripture is little known, the Holy Spirit forgotten and the Father left in the background, we must fight hard not to get carried along with the stream…\(^\text{198}\)
The Council’s Mary-Church analogy had not taken hold. The same author lamented that *Lumen Gentium’s* explanation of Mary’s place in the Church had been left untaught:

> Historically, Mary comes before the Church – at one point she was the whole Church, the whole of consenting humanity, and by her Assumption she is already all that the Church will one day be.199

In spite of the opportunities for presenting the Council’s teaching about Mary and its corresponding statements about the place of Marian devotion, there was – according to Father Carroll –

> *a wall of silence about Mary.* I lived through that time. The silence was very effective. I’m not saying it was deliberate, by and large, but the results were the same. And the silence was far more damning, for more dangerous than open attack on Mary.

> “*We’ll silence her to death!*”200

**CONCLUSIONS**

The many voices of Marian devotion in the U.S., which had been supported for nearly two centuries by the American Bishops, became confused during the years of the Second Vatican Council and – in many instances – were all but totally muted in the decade after the Council, a “decade of silence about Mary.”

Doctrinally, the U.S. Bishops themselves had shown union with the Popes’ definitions of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption; however, their tasks as “Church builders,” kept them – for the most part – from being effective teachers of the Marian dogmas.

On the other hand, in dealing with Marian devotions, the U.S. Bishops supported the wide variety of Marian veneration “imported” from other lands – and in many cases gave their own stamp of “American character” to the exuberant celebrations of Mary that grew through the 1950’s.
The period of Vatican II and its immediate aftermath saw the appearance of many tensions and contradictions in the Church. For a variety of reasons – theological as well as more broadly societal – the Church in the 1960’s appeared divided on the subject of devotion to Mary. A superficial interpretation of the Conciliar debate over the role of Mary and her place in the Church – a debate in which the U.S. Bishops played a pivotal role – aided a diminishment of many forms of public devotion to Mary. The Church put a great deal of emphasis on the role of the liturgy. In the end devotions had, as it were, nowhere to go.201

By 1970, a small group of Bishops would begin to speak about the need to “re-animate” devotion to Mary.
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Chapter 2 – NCCB Debate, Decision and Direction on a Marian Pastoral Letter

“It is many years since those jeweled phrases, ‘House of Gold, Ark of the Covenant, Tower of Ivory, Morning Star...’ were familiar forms of prayer; but their memory lingers like the scent of incense in an empty church, and we are poorer for the silence.”

U.S. Catholic

“The only purpose of the old NCWC was to express the Church’s concern about temporal affairs of the United States.”

Bishop William McManus

“Today, the Conference offers the most effective vehicle nationally for our teaching office.”

James Cardinal Hickey

This chapter studies the earliest suggestions – coming from some Bishops, from clergy and religious, and from some members of the laity – about writing a Pastoral Letter on the Blessed Virgin Mary. Similar and much briefer Pastoral Letters already promulgated by the Bishops’ conferences of other countries are noted. The chapter deals with the eventual decision by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops to write the Pastoral Letter, taking into account a certain degree of tension between the NCCB leadership/staff and a number of Bishops and theologians regarding the use of Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII as the exclusive model for the outline and content of the Pastoral Letter.

2.1 The NCCB, Other Bishops’ Conferences and Other Letters

“We are bishops – we have but one objective: to make disciples of all men.” — John Cardinal Krol

2.1a Background of the NCCB

The body of U.S. Bishops which would consider producing a Pastoral Letter on Mary had a varied half-century history. In 1917 the Bishops of
the United States formed the National Catholic War Council (NCWC) to enable Catholic citizens to contribute funds and to commit personnel to provide spiritual care and recreation to servicemen during World War I. In 1919 Pope Benedict XV urged the hierarchy to join him in working for peace and social justice after World War I; in response, U.S. Bishops organized the National Catholic Welfare Council.

The first Administrative Committee was composed of seven members to handle the NCWC’s business between plenary meetings. At that time the general headquarters were established in Washington, D.C. and a General Secretary with a rather small staff was appointed. The word “Conference” soon replaced “Council” in the organization’s title, underlining the fact that it was consultative rather than legislative. Throughout its first four decades, the body addressed only such concerns as education, immigration, and social reform.5

This model continued until after the Second Vatican Council; in 1966 the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) and the U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC) were established. The NCCB attended to the Church’s own affairs in this country, fulfilling Vatican II’s mandate that bishops “jointly exercise their pastoral office.”6 While NCCB operated through committees made exclusively of Bishops, many of the committees and departments had full-time staff organized in secretariats.7

In the decade after Vatican II, the number of NCCB staff members in Washington DC soared and the Conference’s areas of activity greatly expanded:

> Our national conference … provides a framework and a forum for us to share ideas, to teach and elucidate sound Catholic Doctrine, set pastoral directions and develop policy positions on contemporary social issues.8

Elected by the Bishops in 1966, the first President of the NCCB was Archbishop (later Cardinal) John Dearden9 of Detroit, who served as President until 1971. During that time, the first NCCB General Secretary – a full-time position appointed by Cardinal Dearden and based in DC – was Bishop (later Archbishop and Cardinal) Joseph Bernadin.10 The two men would set and guide the agenda of the NCCB during the immediate post-Conciliar period. Both would try to influence the timeliness and the
content of *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*. In the end, neither man would vote in favor of the document.11

### 2.1b A 1967 Pastoral Letter: “The Church in Our Day”

In November 1967, two years after the conclusion of the Council, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) issued a Pastoral Letter on certain doctrinal problems of the hour; however, it did not mention any problems in Mariology or Marian devotion. Entitled *The Church in Our Day*, the letter came “at a time when faith is challenged on many sides” and focused “on areas of special concern to the Church in the United States in our day,”12 according to Cardinal Dearden, NCCB President. In the 1967 letter, the U.S. Bishops found it “especially necessary to remind all the people of God of the need for continued, strong, and devoted love for Christ’s Church.”

Although *The Church in Our Day* was meant to be “a doctrinal exposition on the life and development of the American Church in light of Vatican II” – especially *The Constitution on the Church (Lumen Gentium)* – the 1967 Pastoral Letter, which was 269 paragraphs in length, contained only one paragraph that mentioned the name of Mary. Paragraph 261, found in the letter’s “Concluding Reflections,” simply stated:

> These prayers we offer through the Virgin Mother of Christ, especially beloved in our country under the title of the Immaculate Conception, addressing our prayers through her the more confidently because of our grateful awareness of Mary’s privileged relations to the Church as these have been proclaimed by the Council, the Holy Father, and the piety of the people.13

Although the Pastoral Letter did treat, for example, the crises in priestly life, in the continuity of the present with the past, in the relationship of conscience with authority, and in regards to several other “problems we face,”14 the U.S. Bishops’ *The Church in Our Day* offered virtually no voice to break the “silence about Mary.”
2.1c The Marian Pastorals of Other Bishops’ Conferences

During the “decade of silence,” the Bishops of several other nations issued brief but intriguing pastoral letters on Mary.

The Bishops of Holland.

From Utrecht, the Bishops of Holland issued a brief (23 paragraphs) joint Pastoral Letter entitled *On Mary* in October 1968. In their introduction, the Dutch Bishops reflected the experiences of Catholics and Catholic Bishops in much of the Western world:

Several times over these last few years we have been asked for a Pastoral Letter on Mary. We have been told that if you write about confusion and renewal, you cannot avoid writing about Mary. In the confusion that has occurred, She has been relegated to a second place. In the renewal, She is hardly venerated anymore (no.1).

Confusion about Mary and loss of veneration for her were common to Europe and North America; but the Dutch Bishops indicated a hesitancy to write solely on the topic of Mary:

A Pastoral Letter on this subject really belongs in a series of letters that attempt to deepen our faith and to encourage its vigorous development…(no.2).

The Bishops of Holland acknowledged the changing times. In their introductory paragraphs, the Bishops’ letter *On Mary* emphasized a general crisis of faith:

In this Pastoral Letter…our words take on a tone and feeling that they probably did not have before. We are living in a time of change of transition. For many, faith is no longer quietly possessed – something that we are clearly assured of. Our faith is attacked and our fidelity put to the test (no. 2).

The brief Dutch letter – rather dark in tone and uncertain about the future – is divided into five principal considerations about Mary and Marian devotion:
1) **The Faith of Mary.** The Bishops of Holland started by placing Mary within “the darkness of abandonment, loneliness and upheaval” of the Crucifixion. “Doubt and uncertainty drove the disciples back to their dwellings with nothing to encourage them. However, faith remained alive and firm in the heart of Mary” (n. 4). The paragraphs treated Mary as a person of faith in a life of difficult trials, as the expectation of Israel, as the believer par excellence and as the Mother of “the fruit of her womb and of her faith” (no. 3–8).

2) **Mary Image of the Church.** The Dutch Bishops, in one lengthy paragraph (no. 9) presented Mary within the context of the Church. They offered an ecclesiology:

   We earnestly long for a truly human Church – a Church which does not present herself above all as a society or institution; a Church that we encounter rather as a community of all those who are united with Christ by faith. This is why we must carefully note that the Council speaks to us of Mary in its presentation of the Church.

   The Dutch Bishops followed the Council’s reasoning, pointing to the Mary-Church relationship.

3) **Mary: Object of a Special Veneration.** The Dutch letter drew attention to two possible dangers – exaggerated sentimentalism as well as a cold refusal to personally encounter the Mother of God. Calling for the veneration of Mary “according to the limits of sound doctrine” (no. 10), the Bishops also called for true devotion to proceed from true faith:

   Here we want to pause a moment and deepen our reflections. We call Mary ‘blessed’ because ‘he Who is mighty did marvels in Her.” All that She is and all that She means for us, Mary owes to the power of divine grace. She is the one who receives for us and in whom we receive (no. 11).

   In this section, the letter treated briefly the two recent Marian dogmas: Mary is worthy of special veneration because “She was saved by Christ and entirely so … not saved by being purified later on in her life, but by
being preserved from all sin in an Immaculate Conception” and “thus, too, the Church believes in the bodily Assumption of Mary into heaven, as the first fruits promised and pledged…” (no. 12).

The Dutch Bishops also seemed to connect Mary’s mediation to that of every other human person, stating that “Mary fulfills a special role in the mediation of grace.

According to faith, every man can already, in view of his relationship with Christ, be a mediator of grace” (no. 13).

4) Mary and Ecumenism. Not surprisingly, this was the longest section of the Dutch letter. “The Church is more than a merely functional institution” and “the generosity of Mary … create(s) a space so that man can truly live” (no. 14).

“Cannot it be possible that in these times of ecumenism She should bring us together rather than separate us?” (no. 15).

“True Marian devotion rises, so to speak, above Itself to become a way toward Christ” for all Christians (no. 16).

God’s plan is to make all men one great family in which we might live together as brothers in a great community of life and love. To this family God has chosen to give a mother – the woman Whom He had given first and before all to His Son as His Mother. Her He has chosen also as a mother of the new people of God (no. 17).

Mary was presented as being for all Christians. “Tradition liked to think of the words of the dying Christ addressed to John and … to all the disciples who follow Christ. ‘Woman, here is your son’” (no. 18).

5) External Forms of Marian Devotion. The Bishops of Holland stated that many modern Catholics experienced a love for Mary “even if today it expresses itself externally in a different way.” They admitted that

It is with a certain reserve that we use these external forms. This change is not an isolated occurrence in comparison to the
past. We can also note, in our time, a change in the relationship between mothers and children. The children are different, freer, more independent, and the love of the child expresses itself in a different way (no. 19).

“It is perhaps along these lines that we must look upon the change in Marian devotion … There is coming about a very great change in devotions,” the Dutch Bishops opined. “That does not mean total abandonment of external forms of respect and love” (no. 20).

Rather than complaining about the abandonment of devotional practices …we want to look with you for new forms …Perhaps we will no longer be able to celebrate feasts of Mary as we once did when we turned them into holidays – something that would be difficult in our modern society (no. 21). Pilgrimages … no longer signify very much to most of us and even seem a bit strange because of their exuberance. But … it may well be that those who make a pilgrimage in this life will feel more deeply what the Church is (no. 22).

Throughout their letter, the Bishops of Holland did not specifically mention the Rosary.

**The Bishops of Australia.**

A year later, in contrast to the Dutch Letter, a special statement was issued by the Australian hierarchy called “Devotion to Mary After the Second Vatican Council.” Only 123 words long, the message of the Bishops of Australia in September 1969 was completely centered on the Rosary:

As the Rosary is a prayer particularly suited to recital by a group of people, the ideals and objective of family prayer have found expression in the family rosary.

The Rosary, of its nature, tend to enliven and deepen understanding of the Divine Fatherhood of Christ, serving as a constant reminder of the paschal mystery.
In this era of Australia’s rapid material development, we must work for the growth of a spiritual vigor as well. As the family rosary has been a powerful instrument for preserving the Gospel message in the days of the pioneers, let us use it now to build up a dedicated body of apostles to preserve and to teach the Gospel message in the days of an expanding nation.\(^\text{15}\)

It is unclear whether the Australian Bishops might have been responding to a request by Father Peyton’s Family Rosary Crusade.\(^\text{16}\) In any case, theirs was one example of the very rare joint statements on Mary or Marian devotion made by any national Bishops’ conferences at the time. It was the only joint statement on Mary issued by the Australian hierarchy until the mid-1970’s, when they re-printed in their own name the U.S. Bishops’ *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith.*

**The Bishops of Poland.**

The 1971 Letter of the Polish Bishops was addressed not to the people of Poland but to “all the Episcopal Conferences of the Catholic world.”\(^\text{17}\)

Initially dark in tone like the Dutch Bishops’ letter, the 15-page Polish letter began by recounting “the miseries of the modern world.” The letter offered to the world’s Bishops the Polish Episcopate’s own experience, “especially during the last two centuries and especially during the last 30 years.” The central purpose of the letter was that the world’s Catholic Bishops might “learn from (the Polish history and dependence on Mary) and profit from it”:

She, the most faithful Virgin, standing with us at the foot of the Cross of our history, guarded the faith even amidst our greatest adversities. We wish to impart this consoling mystery of our history as a great historical experience to the whole afflicted world, showing Mary, Mother of the Church, the pledge of fidelity to God and the Church.

If the Catholic nations wish to remain *semper fidelis,* they must cling to the Immaculate Mother of Christ. We firmly believe this.
We based our conviction on our historical experience. With great joy we confess it to you, Venerable Brothers, and to the whole world…\(^{18}\)

Their letter, the Polish Bishops said, was an exercise in sharing collegiality and responsibility for the Church and the world of the day, as the whole College of Bishops throughout the world had been urged to do by Vatican II (\textit{Ad Gentes} n. 38 and \textit{Christus Dominus}, n. 5–6).

Accordingly, the Bishops of Poland offered three “concrete proposals” to the Pastors of the Church:

\begin{quote}
First, will you introduce in your own countries a new liturgical feast of Our Lady, Mother of the Church on Monday after Pentecost. This date, already approved for Poland by Holy Father Paul VI seems to show the union of the Spouse of the Holy Spirit with the Church and her motherly role in the Church.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Second, will you dedicate to the Mother of the Church and give under her protection all your dioceses, nations and countries and also the whole world and the entire globe.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Third a last urgent plea: Will you, dear Venerable Brothers, join us in asking the Supreme Pastor of the Church, that he deign to dedicate to the Mother of the Church together with all the Bishops of the Catholic world the whole human race. Let us beg the Holy Father to perform this act on the 30\(^{th}\) anniversary of the Consecration of the world to the Immaculate Heart of Mary by Pius XII. This act may be done on Oct. 21, 1972.\(^{19}\)
\end{quote}

The first two signatories on the Polish letter were “Stephan Cardinal Wyszynski, Primate of Poland” and “Karol Cardinal Wojtyla, Archbishop of Cracow.”\(^{20}\)

Among the mixed reactions from around the world was that of the President of the United States’ Bishops’ Conference, Cardinal Dearden, who noted – according to the Confidential Minutes of an NCCB
Administrative Committee meeting – “that the letter reflected petitions previously circulated during the Second Vatican Council.”

2.2 The Work of the Mariological Society of America

Meanwhile, the Mariological Society of America (MSA), founded in 1949, raised voices in support of Marian studies and Marian devotion, giving voice to much that was being left unspoken about Mary elsewhere in the United States.

Before the Council, the MSA had anticipated the Christological/ecclesiological Conciliar debate; during the Council, several MSA members wrote clearly about some of the Council’s effects on Marian doctrine and devotion. By the time of the MSA annual Convention in New York City in 1970 – in the middle of the decade of silence – Alban F. Maguire, O.F.M., President, spoke forthrightly:

The five years since Lumen Gentium seem like a century. And the memory of what took place may become a little blurred. In spite of the assurances of the Fathers, there are many who continue to insist that the Council played down Our Lady’s role in the Church.

Yet for the most part the MSA maintained a positive and prudent approach, placing no blame for the Marian crisis:

There can be no doubt that devotion to Mary has diminished since the Council, yet it would be well for us not to assign causes for this until we have weighed phenomenon more carefully.

During the “decade of silence,” professional members of the MSA frankly addressed such topics as “The Theology of Mary and the Critical Spirit,” “Marian Doctrine as an Ecumenical Problem,” “Integrating Marian Devotion in Catholic Spirituality,” “Psychological Factors in Marian Devotion,” “Marian Theology and the Contemporary Problem of Myth,” “Mary’s Place within the People of God According to Non-Roman Catholics,” “Mariology and Recent Biblical Literature,” “Profile of Marian Devotion on the Parochial Level,” “Mary and the
Crisis of Faith”33, “The Relevance of Mariology and the Role of the Mariologist in the Light of Present Conditions in the Church”34, and “The Decline of Mariology as a Theological Problem”35.

In the last-mentioned article, Father Charles W. Neumann, S.M., frankly summarized that

since things theological are generally in crisis today, specialized Marian theology, of course, shares the lot of theology at large …

To qualify the present state of Mariology in terms other than a decline in interest would be a lie … The number of Marian titles (based on the annual surveys of Marian literature from Eamon R. Carroll, on Laurentin’s biennial Bulletin sur la Vierge Marie, and on Besutti’s bibliographies) has drastically dwindled.36

Further, Neumann traced the decline in interest in Mariology to seven modern factors:

- “A Rationalizing Tendency in Theology” as the focus of theology changes from God to man himself;
- “Changes in Focus of Theological Interest,” from revelation theology to such vital questions of the hour as atheism, war, ecology, race, drugs, abortion etc.;
- “Anti-Doctrinal Bias in Theology Today,” the shift of interest from doctrine to ethics;
- “Decline of the Marian Movement,” an unsustainable climax after the last years of Pius XII’s pontificate and the rise of other movements in the Church;
- “Certain Attitudes of Mariologists,” including clannishness, defensiveness and an aloofness from the rest of theology;
- “Change in Mariological Method,” from an older method whose point of departure was the papal magisterium and Mary’s privileges
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to a newer method based on scriptural and patristic sources, which then studies the development of Marian doctrine and devotion;

● and finally – of greatest concern to Neumann –

“Demythologization,” in which the historicity of Mary’s role, especially in the infancy narratives, has been questioned and often discarded.37

Not ultimately pessimistic, Father Neumann’s article nonetheless mentioned a “profound deafness” with which Mariology was greeted during the years after the Council. As Eamon Carroll said: “If Our Lady were attacked, that’s at least a sign of interest. And it can be defended and you can win people over…”

“But you cannot fight silence!”38

2.3 The Bishops, the Catholic Press and the Catholic People

In the years after the Council, the popular Catholic press in the U.S. saw the loss of a large number of Marian periodicals; far fewer articles on Mary were published. These losses added to the “silence.”

Often, those Catholic magazines that survived did not add a positive voice to discussion of the Virgin. A single – but typical – example was featured in the magazine US Catholic. “What is happening in the parishes and the dioceses?” asked John Mahoney’s 1966 article, “Putting Mary in Her Place”:

At the very zenith of Marian enthusiasm, some thing happened – or rather several things happened. The “Fatima secret” of 1960 fizzled out…Marian magazines suspended publication and ceased to publish …Pastors began to drop the Sorrowful Mother novena … The Council’s decree on the renewal of the liturgy was thought by many to imply that non-liturgical devotions, most of them Marian, were now out of favor in the Church. Out in the dioceses and in the parishes the effect of these things are being felt. Not only are pastors closing novenas, but some are reported as saying, “Forget the rosary – go to Mass.” Some are refusing to enroll in the
Scapular. It is even said that one priest stood in his pulpit and ripped a rosary apart to dramatize that the era has ended.

What does all of this really mean? That Mary is finally being ‘put in her place’? Essentially, that is exactly what it does mean.39

But it would be a mistake to blame the media for creating the post-Conciliar Marian confusion or for causing the silence. During the Council’s sessions, the press followed closely the Conciliar debates on the mystery of Mary. “We should have equally expected that the post-Conciliar ‘fallout’ would be reported extensively.”40

Another popular Catholic Magazine, the Jesuit monthly America, carried a regular column entitled “The Word.” Vincent McCorry, S.J. attempted one month to put the Marian crisis in historical perspective and to raise a voice in the face of the silence:

It is not the first time, of course, that our Lady (as Catholics tenderly call her) has been a theological storm center. Yet the present controversy may well be unlike any other of its kind. Always before, the clash occurred between pro-Marianists and anti-Marianists, each party uninhibitedly assaulting with hoarse shouts of “Heresy!” the doctrinal position of the other…

Here is where and why pain and alarm are being felt in the household of the Catholic faith. Mary of Nazareth has been for so long the Mother in the house. Must we now take down her gentle picture from the wall lest it detract from the open Bible on the table? Is the rosary but a sentimental Relic of outmoded, bourgeois piety?…

The fact is that Mary of Nazareth, the Mother of the Savior, the Mother of God, does not represent a theological afterthought. As is clear from the nature of the earliest heresies, the Mother of Christ is profoundly, intrinsically involved in the most essential Christian teachings. Excise Mary from the Incarnation and there is no Incarnation…
Protests against exaggeration and sentimentality in Marian devotion will always be welcome – as in any other area of religion. But the Mother of Christ is here to stay…41

A response the following month from a Rosedale, N.Y. reader was typical:

Dear Editor:

God bless Fr. McCorry (for) his affirmation that the Church is not about to belittle the Mother of Jesus… I recently visited a new church in Indiana that has the “way-out” people drooling. Mary has no place in it! …42

The Bishops, too, were hearing from their people. In the heart of middle America, Mr. and Mrs. James H. Jost of Wauwatosa, Wisc., wrote to their Archbishop, William E. Cousins of Milwaukee43:

Sept. 18, 1970

Most Rev. Archbishop Cousins:

We are looking forward to October, the month of Our Lady, with great joy yet we know there are many hearts suffering from doubts and confusion, due to the “too many Prophets” in the renewal of the Church.

The sadness that prevails in many hearts (young and old) need not be… We are fortunate here at our parish church, as we have Rosary devotions throughout May and October, as well as Mother of Perpetual Help Devotions and Mass every Tuesday – but this is not the case in all parishes. In conversations with friends throughout Milwaukee, the Rosary devotions have been discontinued, as well as Novena services – and much to our saddened hearts, Mary is even downgraded by some religious. It would please God, we’re sure, as well as His people if you would send out a Pastoral Letter on the Blessed Virgin Mary at this time…
We realize, Most Reverend Archbishop, that you have many pressing problems … Thank you for your kind indulgence in this letter and we pray that we may look forward to a Pastoral Letter on the Blessed Virgin Mary – if not before October, in the very near future.

Prayerfully,
Mr. and Mrs. James H. Jost
CC: Most Rev. Joseph Bernardin
    Gen. Sec’y, National Conference of Catholic Bishops

Archbishop Cousins’ Sept. 25, 1970 reply to the Jost’s encouraged fidelity to the Council and expressed his opinion that Marian devotion had somehow become stronger:

My dear Mr. and Mrs. Jost:

I deeply appreciate your comments … We need only to read the documents of Vatican Council on Our Blessed lady to know how completely she remains in the picture. She is frequently referred to in our liturgical prayers, and any discounting of the devotion due her comes from a very small minority whose voices are drowned out by the Marian devotion which, if anything, has become more firmly established in the minds of the largest percentage of Our Catholic people.

Interestingly, Archbishop Cousins also took note of the copy of their letter which had been sent to Bishop Bernardin at the NCCB:

I acknowledge your letter … I am also aware that you have referred this same matter to the body of Bishops through its General Secretary, Bishop Bernardin.

Indeed, two months later, according to the Confidential Minutes of the NCCB Administrative Committee, Bishop Bernardin would report “briefly on various requests received relative to the coming general meeting” mentioning for the first time that “several letters have spoken of the need for a national pastoral on the Blessed Virgin Mary.”
There is no record of further conversation regarding a Marian pastoral at that 1970 meeting; but John Cardinal Carberry, Archbishop of St. Louis and a member of the Administrative Committee, had heard Bishop Bernardin’s report.

While still in Washington, Cardinal Carberry immediately brought the idea before the Board of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception.

A Pastoral Letter on Mary would have its origins there.

2.4 The Question Before the Shrine Board/
Response of Theologians

At the mid-fall 1970 meeting of the Shrine Board, Cardinal Carberry brought up to the other members the question of reanimating Marian devotion in the United States. Those present at the meeting included people in the fields of communications and public relations.

During the discussion, the idea for a Marian Pastoral Letter from all the Bishops was raised.

Father Eamon Carroll, a member of the Shrine’s “Iconography Committee” was present at the meeting. He said the suggestion gradually took hold.

During the winter months that followed, Cardinal Carberry and Monsignor Francis McDonough, director of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, corresponded in order to determine the best manner in which to proceed. Cardinal Carberry was convinced that the NCCB should act, based on both the need for reanimating Marian devotion and the newly-defined role of the post-Conciliar Episcopal conferences:

The Episcopal Conferences demanded by the development of the world are not just a practical arrangement, but are truly a possible and appropriate manifestation of the solidarity of the Episcopal body.

Additionally, Cardinal Carberry and the Shrine Board determined that the body of U.S. Bishops would need the assistance of theologians to produce a Marian letter.
On March 8, 1971 Monsignor McDonough of the National Shrine sent a letter to approximately one dozen U.S. theologians, informing them that Cardinal Carberry had asked him to contact some theologians “skilled in the mystery of Mary” and invite them to draw up a rough schema (“restricted to one page”) outlining what they thought a Pastoral Letter on Mary should contain. He asked them to keep in mind that a Marian Pastoral should gear itself to the laity. “This approach, of course, does not bypass our priests.”

Monsignor McDonough further informed (and then cautioned) the theologians:

Cardinal Carberry is willing to bring before the Board of the NCCB, which will meet in Detroit at the end of April, this question of a National Pastoral on the Blessed Mother…

It might be well not to mention the Pastoral until writing it receives the approval of the Bishops.

The theologians’ responses were to be sent to Monsignor McDonough at the National Shrine (“no later than the beginning of April”) so that they could be forwarded to Cardinal Carberry before the Spring Bishops’ meeting.

Responses came from 14 different theologians who proposed 88 topics in 26 pages of suggestions.

- The Rev. William J. Cole, S.M., of the University of Dayton
  11 topics on one page;

- The Rev. Richard Kugelman, C.P., Chairman of the Department of Theology at St. John’s University, Jamaica, NY
  4 topics on one page;

- The Rev. Eugene McAlee, C.S.s.R., of Mount St. Alphonsus Seminary, Esopus NY
  12 topics on four pages;
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- The Rev. Edward D. O’Connor, C.S.C. of the Department of Theology at the University of Notre Dame, Indiana
  5 topics on two pages;

- The Rev. Titus Cranny, S.A., of the Franciscan Friars of the Atonement at the Atonement Friary in Cumberland, RI
  4 topics on one page;

- The Reverends Daniel Hickey, C.Ss.R. and John Craghan, C.Ss.R, both of Mount St. Alphonsus Seminary, Esopus, NY
  6 topics on one page;

- The Rev. Walter J. Burghardt, S.J. of Woodstock College in New York
  3 topics on one page;

- The Rev. Eamon R. Carroll, O.Carm, of the School of Sacred Theology at the Catholic University of America in Washington, DC
  6 topics on one page;

- The Rev. R.J. Hennessey, O.P.
  8 topics on one page;

- The Rev. George Kirwin, O.M.I. of Oblate College in Washington D.C.
  7 topics on four pages;

  12 topics on one page;

- The Dominican Matthew F. Morry, O.P. of Providence College in Rhode Island
  7 topics on two pages;

- Rev. Thomas Barosse, C.S.C.
  6 topics on six pages;

A total of 88 topics on 26 pages.
Eight of the theologians asked that strong emphasis be placed on the Mary/Church relationship:

Father McAlee (“The Mary/Church relationship can be shown in a biblical way, and be grasped by all readers if properly expressed”); Father Cranny (“She is the Mother of the Church, but among them all, not apart from all”); Fathers Hickey/Craghan (“She is a unique member in the vast cast of characters in salvation history, she makes the Church’s concerns her concerns; Mary is never alone. She is always with the people of the Church”); Father Burghardt (“Mary in ceaseless relation to the Church”); Father Carroll (“The knowledge of Mary’s true place leads us to a deeper appreciation of the Church”); Father Hennessey (“The letter must not give the impression that Mary belongs to only one group in the Church”); Father Kirwin (“Mary as the personification of the people of God, the Church”); and Father Barosse (“The Church as a family, with Mary as a member/mother of the family).

Likewise, eight of the theologians wrote that emphasis should surely be placed on the Mary/Christ relationship:

Father O’Connor (“Present Mary as an integral part of the mystery of Christ”); Father Cranny (“Mary is inseparable from Jesus, the Word of God and her Son”); Fathers Hickey/Craghan (“The glory of her Son is hers”); Father Burghardt (“Mary in ceaseless relation to Christ”); Father Carroll (“Mary joined by an inseparable bond to the saving work of her Son”); Father Hennessey (“The inseparability of between union with Christ and union with Mary”); Father Kirwin (“She is associated with Christ then and now”); and Father Morry (“Her Union with Christ in the work of salvation”).

The theologians – as if a mirror image of the conciliar debate – were equally vocal about the importances of the Mary/Church and Mary/Christ relationships.

In a similar way, seven of the theologians (Fathers Cole, Kugelman, McAlee, O’Connor, Hickey/Craghan, Kirwin, and Barosse) replied that the Marian dogmas should be a topic addressed; for example, Father O’Connor wrote:
There should be a plain (but not pugnacious or argumentative) reaffirmation that the Immaculate Conception, the Virgin Birth, and the Assumption are not myths which we could think of discarding but are the foundation stones of our understanding of Mary.  

Seven of the respondents asked that the Pastoral “follow the direction of Chapter Eight of Lumen Gentium and be very much along biblical and conciliar lines” (Father Carroll, and echoed by Fathers Cole, Kugelman, McAlee, Burghardt, Falls and Morry).

Six expressed the desire that the Pastoral Letter keep in mind and/or address Mary’s role in the ecumenical movement. Six asked that the letter be primarily biblical.

Five of the theologians responded that Mary in the Liturgy should be a topic and five wrote that Marian devotions should be treated. Four thought that Mary’s virginity should be further explained; four wanted a further explanation of her maternity.

The strongest language in the responses dealt with the very language of the Pastoral Letter itself:

Father O’Connor (“It should not try to be eloquent and inspirational. This usually comes out sounding unconvincing”); Father Burghardt (“Better to have no pastoral than a bad pastoral. And a bad pastoral on Mary is very easy to do. It would repeat pious platitudes; it would emphasize Marian prerogatives; its language would be dreadfully outmoded”); and Father Carroll (“Caution: avoid rhetoric of pre-Conciliar Marian letters, such as the encyclicals, etc.; tone down superlatives with respect to the Mother of Jesus; prepare for reading aloud”).

Other intriguing topics or proposals mentioned were to “Contact Rene Laurentin for guidance”; “Avoid both minimalism and maximalism”; “Make no mention of titles coredemptrix or mediatrix”; “Face up to the current concern about our Lady like the Dutch Bishops did”; and “Treat recent Marian apparitions as they stress the notion of peace.”

One of the theologians suggested that the Pastoral Letter urge the Bishops to “recommend national, diocesan and parochial religious
pilgrimages” and to “reconsecrate the nation to Mary under the title of Our Lady of Unity.”  

The responses were returned to the director of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception; it was not surprising that the first suggestion about pilgrimages became an important part of the Pastoral Letter, while the latter suggestion was not considered.

All in all, the theologians’ responses reflected many of the tensions within the Mariology of the day. Father Burghardt wrote, no doubt with conviction but surely with some exaggeration,

> The pastoral must operate out of awareness of a new factor; for an alarmingly large percentage of Catholics, Mary is dead. Traditional ideas of imitation, of universal mediation, of “to Jesus through Mary” spirituality – this type of theology will find a very unresponsive audience.

It would now be up to the National Conference of Catholic Bishops to agree to break the “deadly silence” and by the words of a Pastoral Letter try to reanimate the role of Mary in the lives of many American Catholics.

### 2.5 Correspondence Between the Cardinals

For Cardinal Carberry and the other members of the National Shrine’s board – who already had the recommendations of theologians in hand – the next order of business prior to approaching the leaders of the NCCB was to determine if the U.S. Bishops had at any time in their history issued a joint Pastoral Letter on Mary.

Monsignor McDonough of the Shrine staff was informally appointed to research the issue and, shortly after Holy Week and Easter of 1971, reported by both telephone and letter to Cardinal Carberry. The Shrine’s director had determined that “there has never been a National Pastoral of the American Bishops on the subject of the Blessed Mother.”  

Monsignor McDonough did find and note the four previous letters in which the Virgin Mary was mentioned (and as discussed in Chapter 1):
1792: The first Pastoral Letter by Bishop (John) Carroll spoke of the Blessed Mother, but not as the main point of the letter.

1846: The Bishops assembled at Baltimore selected the Immaculate Conception as the patroness of the U.S.

1849: The U.S. Bishops approved the forthcoming papal definition of the Immaculate Conception.

1919: A post-war Pastoral Letter mentioned Mary and the completion of a National Shrine in her honor.

Monsignor McDonough’s report did not include the very brief mention of Mary in the U.S. Bishops’ 1966 letter on certain post-Conciliar problems, *The Church in Our Day* (mentioned earlier in this chapter). “It is extremely fitting,” Monsignor McDonough concluded in his April 16 report, “that a Pastoral Letter of the American Bishops should be issued dealing solely with the role of the Blessed Mother.”

### 2.5a Cardinal Carberry’s Letter of Request

On the very day he received Monsignor McDonough’s report, Cardinal Carberry – armed with the information that there were no previous Marian letters – was ready to make a first official request of Cardinal Dearden and the Bishops’ Conference. An N.C.C.B. Administrative Board meeting was scheduled for April 24; Cardinal Carberry wrote to the N.C.C.B. President on April 16, 1971 in his own name as Cardinal-Archbishop of St. Louis:

April 16, 1971

Your Eminence,

For some time the Executive Committee of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception has considered requesting a National Pastoral Letter on the topic of Our Blessed Lady. Monsignor McDonough, Director of the Shrine, tells me there has never been a National Pastoral on the part of the Bishops on this particular topic. May I
respectfully ask your consideration and if you deem advisable the consideration of the Administrative Committee on this matter. Monsignor McDonough has consulted a number of scholars as to material which might be incorporate into such a Pastoral Letter. I realize, Your Eminence, that there are so many topics presented for consideration you may feel this matter deserves.

With prayerful good wishes, and looking forward to seeing you in Detroit, I remain,

Sincerely yours in Christ,
John Joseph Cardinal Carberry
Archbishop of Saint Louis\textsuperscript{71}

Encls.
Cc: Most Rev. Joseph Bernardin
    Rev. Msgr. William F. McDonough

(The enclosures included the 26 pages of written replies from the theologians who had been asked by Monsignor McDonough for their sugestions regarding a Marian Pastoral Letter.)

Cardinals Carberry and Dearden had been elevated to the Sacred College by Pope Paul VI in the same consistory in 1969. In fact Carberry, born in 1904, was Cardinal Dearden’s senior by three years. Yet the tone of this letter (and dozens of others to come) revealed Cardinal Carberry’s acute consciousness of ecclesiastical protocol. He was writing not only to a fellow Cardinal, but to the President of the National Conference.

Even though there were “so many topics presented for consideration to the (NCCB) Administrative Committee,” Cardinal Carberry made this request for a Marian Pastoral Letter personally and directly (“May I respectfully ask your consideration and if you deem it advisable the consideration of the Administrative Committee…”) as one of the then only three U.S. Cardinals – writing to a fellow Cardinal.
2.5b Cardinal Dearden’s Hesitant Response

Even before the Administrative Board met, Cardinal Dearden responded personally to Cardinal Carberry:

April 20, 1971

Your Eminence,

Thank you for sending me the material drawn up by the Executive Committee of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception incorporating their suggestions on a proposed national Pastoral Letter on the topic of our Blessed Lady. If we can find the right occasion and take a balanced approach, I believe that it can do much good. I particularly favor Father Burghardt’s suggestion that it be drawn up in the context of the Church and see that there is incorporated in that a strong section on our Blessed Lady. In any matter, even at this initial stage, some endorsement would need to be given by the Administrative Committee to the project. If, after that, there seems to be some wisdom in having a text prepared, this could be indicated. I should mention that, at the present time, we have proposals on and for about four or five different pastoral letters, statements, or messages. Because of the character of this spring’s meeting, many of these will have to be handled through other channels. What we seem to need greatly at this time is some means of communication that will enable us to speak on many issues without the formality of lengthy statements such as we used in the past.

With every good wish, I am
Cordially yours in Chris,
+JFD
Archbishop of Detroit
President, NCCB

In the one-page letter from Cardinal Dearden, in which he stated that he believes the proposed letter “can do much good,” nine hesitancies about a Pastoral Letter on Mary can be identified:
• “If we can find the right occasion…”

• “…take a balanced approach…”

• “…write on the subject of the Church…”

• “…see that there is incorporated a strong section on our Blessed Lady”

• “…even at this initial stage, some endorsement would need to be given…”

• “If, after that, there seems to be some wisdom in having a text prepared…”

• “We have proposals on hand for four of the five different pastoral letters…”

• “…many of these will have to be handled through other channels…”

• “without the formality of lengthy statements…”

In sum, Cardinal Dearden expressed hesitation about the timeliness of a letter; about a balanced approach, probably hearkening back to the Council debate; about writing on the subject of the Church instead; about devoting only a strong section to Mary; about the need for a more general and wider endorsement; further hesitation and the need for wisdom; about the number of Pastoral Letters on hand and their priority; about handling the topic through other channels, perhaps not by a Pastoral Letter; about the formality of lengthy statements and their wordiness.

Once again adhering to the Council’s treatment of Mary in Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII, Cardinal Dearden specifically pointed out that “I particularly favor Father Burghardt’s suggestion that it be drawn up in the context of the Church”73 (emphasis added).

Cardinal Carberry knew the workings of the NCCB; he sent a copy of his letter to Bishop Bernardin. Bernardin’s reply was dated the same as Cardinal Dearden’s – four days prior to the Administrative
Board’s meeting. He wrote to Cardinal Carberry, “As soon as I have an opportunity I shall speak to Cardinal Dearden to see how he wishes to handle the matter…I shall do everything possible to see to it that proper consideration is given to this request.”

2.5c The Administrative Committee’s Initial “Endorsement”

The NCCB Administrative Committee met four days after Cardinal Dearden’s letter of reply to Cardinal Carberry. Not surprisingly, the Confidential Minutes of the April 24, 1971 meeting mirrored very closely the tone and content of Cardinal Dearden’s letter written and sent the week prior.

The Confidential Minutes of the Administrative Board meeting read:

Bishop Bernardin read from a letter sent to the Conference by Cardinal Carberry on behalf of the Executive Committee for the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. The letter suggests that the Bishops give serious consideration to the possibility of issuing a pastoral letter on the Blessed Mother.

After some discussion of the proposal, it was moved and seconded that Cardinal Dearden be authorized to form a small committee to prepare a draft for the consideration of the Bishops. It was agreed that the document should present the Blessed Mother and her role in an ecclesiological setting as was done in Lumen Gentium.

The motion carried.

Importantly an indication of the Board’s discussion of the proposed Pastoral Letter was a hand-written note – authorship unknown – in the margin of the archived copy of the minutes: “Post-Conciliar weaknesses cannot be strengthened by pre-Conciliar measures.”

Cardinal Dearden – perhaps because of his own stated hesitations – wrote no letter.

And instead of responding with his usual quickness, Bishop Bernardin waited two and a half weeks to send a letter to Cardinal Carberry regarding the Administrative Board’s decision:
The Administrative Committee on April 24 approved the idea and authorized Cardinal Dearden to appoint a committee to proceed with the matter. The Bishops attending the meeting expressed the conviction that what is said about the Blessed Mother and her role in the life of the church today should be placed in an ecclesiological context. They specifically referred to the treatment given to the Blessed Mother in Lumen Gentium as the approach which should be taken in this instance.77

2.5d Choosing the Bishop-Members of the Ad Hoc Committee

The same May 12, 1971 letter from Bishop Bernardin informed Cardinal Carberry that Cardinal Dearden “kindly asks you to serve as chairman of the ad hoc committee to be established” for the purpose of writing the letter. Other Bishop-members would be appointed by Cardinal Dearden as NCCB President; but he asked for Cardinal Carberry’s recommendations:

In accordance with our regulations, the President appoints all of the members of ad hoc committees. Before doing so, however, he would like to have your recommendations to add to those he has already received from other sources. I presume that a committee of three would be sufficient.

Theologian-members of the ad hoc committee were to be selected by the Bishop-members, as Bishop Bernardin informed: “The committee, in turn, could avail itself of theologians who would have a contribution to make in this field.”78

Within less than a week, Cardinal Carberry wrote to Bishop Bernardin, with a list of three Bishops for Cardinal Dearden’s consideration:

As possible members of the committee for Cardinal Dearden to consider may I suggest the following names: Archbishop Timothy Manning of Los Angeles Archbishop Humbert Medeiros Boston Bishop David Maloney of Wichita, Kansas…”
Ever the Churchman, Cardinal Carberry had suggested two Archbishops who were very likely to become Cardinals within the year. Archbishop Manning of Los Angeles was “Irish-born and very well known for his Marian outlook,” according to Father Carroll. Archbishop Medeiros was considered by Cardinal Carberry to be “a theologian of standing” and Father Carroll recalled that he was “a very Marian Bishop … He had written a Pastoral Letter on Mary in his archdiocese,” in which Archbishop Medeiros had tried so many things … Let us approach Mary, so dear to her Son, through the Rosary … for the peace this world cannot give.”

Bishop Maloney of Wichita, Cardinal Carberry wrote, “at the present time is a member of the Doctrinal Committee (of the NCCB).” Cardinal Carberry had known Bishop Maloney for years. They met regularly when the NCCB gathered according to “regions;” Region IX included the arch/dioceses in the states of Missouri, Kansas and Iowa.

Surely matters did not proceed as quickly as Cardinal Carberry might have hoped. He waited until July 21 – over two months – when he wrote to Bishop Bernardin:

At this time, Your Excellency, may I inquire if any action has been taken with reference to the Committee of the preparation for the Pastoral Letter on Our Blessed Mother. I believe I answered your letter of some time ago and submitted a few names for consideration. You indicated at that time that His Eminence, Cardinal Dearden, would obtain suggestions from other sources and finally name the Committee to work on the Pastoral.

Cardinal Carberry’s letter spurred Bishop Bernardin to refer the matter to Cardinal Dearden. On July 29, Bishop Bernardin sent Cardinal Dearden a letter concerning several matters, among which he mentioned:

I am enclosing a copy of a second letter which I have received from Cardinal Carberry concerning the establishment of an ad hoc committee to prepare a Pastoral Letter on the Blessed Mother … In order to expedite matters, perhaps it would be well if you wrote directly to Cardinal Carberry.
Nevertheless, two more weeks passed before Cardinal Dearden wrote to Cardinal Carberry.85

Naturally, I am pleased to approve your suggestion for membership on the committee the names of Archbishop Humberto S. Medeiros, Archbishop Timothy Manning, and Bishop David M. Maloney. I have written to them asking them to serve.

But even though he had said previously that a committee of “three would be sufficient,” Cardinal Dearden planned to appoint additional Bishop-members to the ad hoc Committee – very likely those whose names he had received “from other sources,” perhaps from the Administrative Board’s discussion or from Bishop Bernardin:

At the same time, however, I have thought it good to invite to serve with you: Bishop John J. Dougherty, because of his special competence in the area of Scripture and Bishop William W. Baum, because of his general awareness of the ecumenical dimensions of such a formulation.

Bishop Dougherty,86 a former professor of Scripture, was Auxiliary of the Archdiocese of Newark and Bishop (later Archbishop and Cardinal) Baum87 had vast experience in ecumenism. Father Carroll said of Bishop Baum, “In my judgment – and the other Bishops on the committee were good theologians – Baum was particularly alert to the nuances.”88

Cardinal Dearden had another suggestion for the ad hoc Committee:

While I have not invited Bishop-elect Lucker, you may think it of advantage to consider him as an additional member of the committee. He has a special competence in the field of theology and also in the general field of religious education. If you think it advisable to have him participate, do not hesitate to invite him.

There are no records to indicate that either Cardinal Carberry or Cardinal Dearden ever sent a letter of invitation to Bishop Raymond Lucker89. He never became a member of the ad hoc Committee.
Cardinal Dearden’s letter ended with another caution that the Pastoral Letter was to closely follow *Lumen Gentium* Chapter 8:

> We all realize that what we have in mind is a substantive Pastoral that will, in a sense, relate the material of *Lumen Gentium* on the subject of our Blessed Lady to the needs of our own people. Admittedly, such a task will have to be done with great care.\(^90\)

On the same day that he told Cardinal Carberry “I have written to (the Bishops) asking them to serve,” Cardinal Dearden did send letters to Archbishops Medeiros and Manning and Bishops Maloney and Baum – three months after the original suggestions had been made.

> My purpose in writing to you is to ask whether you would consent to serve on the ad hoc committee to prepare a Pastoral Letter on our Blessed Mother. It is my belief that you will have an important contribution to make to the drafting of such a document.\(^91\)

And once again Cardinal Dearden issued the caveat:

> The intent (is) to have the committee prepare a document in accord with the orientation of *Lumen Gentium*. Its focus, naturally, will be on the reaffirmation of the importance in a Christian life of the role of our Blessed Lady.

Cardinal Dearden gave assurance to the Archbishops that they would have assistance in writing the Pastoral Letter. “It is understood, of course, that (you) may call upon the counsel of theologians, according to (your) own best judgment.”

### 2.6 The Bishops Preliminary Outline – The Committee’s First Meetings

Meanwhile, Cardinal Carberry and the three Arch/bishops he had selected decided to meet prior to inviting the additional Bishops and theologians to join them. According to the minutes of a Sept. 14, 1971 meeting,\(^92\) four members of the ad hoc Committee – Cardinal Carberry, Archbishops Manning and Medeiros, and Bishop Maloney (along with
Monsignor McDonough and Father Carroll, but without Bishops Baum and Dougherty) gathered for a discussion of the proposed structure of the Pastoral Letter.

They determined that the letter would have two parts. Part One would be a simple, short 1,000-word statement to be read from pulpits (and written by the Bishops themselves). It would declare the main thoughts of the Bishops simply, “leaving the theological and historical development and all such ‘research’ to a scholarly discourse” which would be Part Two. The second part would be developed by Fr. Eamon Carroll and other invited theologians. The Bishops included a caution; the work of the theologians would be subject to re-working by Bishops. The Pastoral Letter in toto would have to be the Bishops’ own statement.

i. At this preliminary meeting, the Bishops made several decisions about Part One.

ii. Part One, a strong simple statement, would be “addressed to our people” and affirm “Mary’s place in Catholic faith, Catholic life and Catholic devotion.”

iii. This was in response to a general desire of the people for a clear affirmation that “our Marian devotion is strong and firm, continuing our Catholic traditions.” This was necessary in order to clear up “some confusion and misunderstanding of Vatican II’s intention and purpose.”

iv. Father Carroll’s statement met agreement from the Bishops present: “In other ages, men built cathedrals and shrines to Mary. The shrine our generation has built is the Chapter on Mary in Lumen Gentium. This is the first such presentation by a Council of the Church’s faith concerning Mary and her part in the work of our salvation.”

v. Cardinal Manning, who maintained that “there is no part of our faith which does not involve Mary,” called for Part One to be a short “credo” about Mary setting forth the four defined articles of faith: the Divine Maternity, her Perpetual Virginity, the Immaculate Conception and Mary’s Assumption. This credo, he hoped, would be built around the Divine Praises.
The Bishops’ plan, according to the minutes, was to state briefly and positively in Part One what was to be justified theologically in Part Two. This doctrinal development would be entrusted to the theologians, especially Father Carroll, who impressed the Bishops as “a young, Roman-trained Mariologist, close by at Catholic University.”

Part Two was also discussed by the Bishops. They made three observations about its content:

i. It would be shown that all Marian dogma is inseparable from Christ, connecting the mystery of Mary with the mystery of Christ and the Church. This doctrinal basis was well-summarized, the Bishops said, in *Lumen Gentium*.

ii. Mary and the mystery of the Church would be demonstrated from her maternity; her motherhood of the Mystical Body; her faith, obedience and love as type or model for believers; her Assumption as eschatological hope; her virtues as an antidote for modern evils; her example for family life and her intercession for world peace.

iii. A section on Marian devotion would explain and encourage the Rosary and other devotions such as litanies, processions, crownings, shrines, pilgrimages, etc. while leaving room for variety in local and national traditions and customs as well as cultural attitudes. Archbishop Manning insisted that “we should not call ‘superstitious’ devotion which is foreign to our dispositions.”

Finally, at this preliminary meeting, the Bishops were “undecided” about whether the Pastoral Letter would have a “conclusion.”

Bishop Maloney added seven “personal comments” in a letter he sent four days later:

1) Emphasize that Mary gave humanity to Christ and so our humanity jointed to Christ’s;

2) Include the Patristic antecedents: Mary and Eve, Woman clothed w sun, etc.
3) Put the four defined doctrines in their overall context;

4) Strongly emphasize the doctrine that all depends on Christ;

5) Consider what would be said on open questions such as Mary as Mediatrix; “the time may not be ripe, but idea is widespread”;

6) Part One must be a strong endorsement of popular devotions in addition to liturgy; N.B. Monsignor McDonough of the Shrine wants an explicit endorsement of pilgrimages;

7) Does ecumenism have a place into Part 1? How is it to be introduced into Part 2?

All seven of Bishop Maloney’s points would be considered — and, for the most part, included — in the various drafts and final version of the Pastoral Letter. As if in answer to Bishop Maloney’s last question, a “Proposed statement on Our Lady and ecumenism” arrived at the NCCB and was forwarded to Cardinal Carberry in early November, 1971:

We must consider the Virgin Mary in the context of ecumenism. She is the Mother of Christ and of all Christians. Genuine love for her promotes Christian unity; it does not impede it. Many difficulties about Our Lady arise from a misunderstanding of her role in the life of Christ and of the Church. Catholics should realize fully the function of Mary so that they may appreciate her role as Mother of Jesus, the divine Redeemer, and as the holiest and perfect member of the Church as well as its Mother.

The proposed statement came from Fr. Titus Cranny, S.A. of the Franciscan Friars of the Atonement. He volunteered to expand on the statement; however, perhaps because of Bishop Baum’s expertise in the ecumenical field, Fr. Cranny was not asked to serve as one of the theologian-members of the ad hoc committee.
2.6a Father Carroll’s “Towards a Pastoral on Our Lady”

Father Carroll was “the first to put pen to paper.” He composed a brief, two and-one-half page paper, “Notes Toward a National Pastoral on Our Lady.” (This would eventually be included in “Draft A.”) Father Carroll addressed the following points:

- “It is not a ‘dark age’; we admit that devotions have waned and that doctrine has been denied …(but) Mary remains a sign of sure hope.”

- “A false impression is common that the Council ‘cut back’ on the Blessed Virgin … It said more about Our Lady than any Council ever did before… We desire to answer false fears by presenting in our own words the gloriously positive teaching.”

- “The Blessed Virgin never stands alone … she is the perfect disciple of her Son.”

- “God gave her to us as a model… Her virginity is a sign of the ‘new creation’ and of the Church’s fidelity to Christ.”

- “In her pilgrimage of faith — from Nazareth to Bethlehem to Jerusalem, from Cana to Calvary to the Cenacle, Mary shared intimately in the saving work of her Son.”

- “She is a sign of hope and comfort for the pilgrim people of God until the Lord returns.”

- ”(To answer) the slump in popular devotions, we must rediscover the incredibly rich treasures of liturgical prayer in honor of Mary.”

- ”Old devotions can take on new life … Rosary … custom of pilgrimages.”

- “Increasing ecumenical dialogue about the Virgin Mary has been a bright spot of recent years…”

In this brief paper, Father Carroll acknowledged the “Marian crisis” and addressed the Council’s teaching on Mary; he connected her to the saving
work of Christ and to the Church, and presented her as a model; and he mentioned devotions — ancient but given new life.

These “Notes Toward a National Pastoral on Our Lady” closely followed the teaching of *Lumen Gentium*, referring to it twelve times. Each of the Bishop members of the *ad hoc* committee received a copy of Father Carroll’s paper, to have it in hand at their next meeting.

### 2.6b The Second Meeting of the Bishops’ *Ad Hoc* Committee

On November 14, 1971, the *ad hoc* Committee met for the second time. The Sunday meeting — held at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington, DC — was held one day prior to the annual Fall Meeting of all the U.S. Bishops.

Present were Cardinal Carberry, Bishop Maloney, Bishop Dougherty, Bishop Baum, Monsignor McDonough and Father Carroll. Archbishops Manning and Medeiros were absent.

Among the major topics discussed at the meeting were:

- **Possible titles of the Letter.** Suggestions included “Mary in Our Day”, “Mary in Our Life”, and “The Role of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God in the Mystery of Christ and the Church” (taken directly from *Lumen Gentium*).

- **Tentative outline of the Letter,** with reference to Father Carroll’s paper. Again, the committee had in mind a Letter of two parts:
  1) **Introduction** (“a reaffirmation on the part of the entire hierarchy of its love and devotion to Our Lady … warm and pastoral in tone, easily understood.”)
  2) **Body of the Pastoral Letter** “an extensive, scholarly treatment of the teaching on Mary as found in Chapter VIII of *Lumen Gentium* … to make LG live for our people. It will be the work of scholarly consultants.” (This would in fact be the two-part structure of the Letter.)
Theological Consultants. It was agreed that Father Carroll “would be the chief architect” of the Pastoral Letter. The Bishops discussed with Father Carroll several additional consultants who might assist him. The following were chosen:

- Reverend Richard Kugelman, C.P.\textsuperscript{99}
- Reverend Frederick Jelly, O.P.\textsuperscript{100}
- Reverend Walter Burghardt, S.J.
- Monsignor Thomas Falls, of Philadelphia\textsuperscript{101}
- Reverend Hugh O’Connell, C.SS.R\textsuperscript{102}

It was determined that Cardinal Carberry would write to the theologians and ask them to confer with Father Carroll. (With the exception of Fr. Burghardt — who had other commitments — all of the theological consultants would agree to take part in the writing of the Letter.)

Tentative timeline for the Letter. The \textit{ad hoc} committee decided on November, 1972 as the projected date for the promulgation of the Letter. Cardinal Carberry sent the tentative timeline to Bishop Bemardin\textsuperscript{103}, who replied that the timetable seemed “very realistic”.\textsuperscript{104} (In reality, the Letter would be promulgated in November, 1973 — a year later than tentatively proposed.)

Also at this meeting, the committee members anticipated that the Pastoral Letter would go through only three drafts (A, B, and C). In fact, there would be four drafts.

\subsection*{2.6c A Request from a Woman}

On November 28, 1971 a retired School Sister of Notre Dame wrote to Bishop Bernardin at the NCCB offices:\textsuperscript{105}
Dear Most Rev. Bernardin,

The need for a pastoral letter on devotion to Our Lady of the Rosary seems very timely ….

I look for a unity in keeping up devotions to the Mother of the Church, bringing back the devotion and Novenas so hastily discarded by the ‘mini’ theologians.

Hopefully in Our Eucharistic Lord and Our Lady,
Sister Maria F., SSND

Bishop Bernardin replied on December 13: 106

Dear Sister Maria,

I wish to acknowledge your letter of November 28. I am grateful to receive your thoughts on the need for increased devotion to the Blessed Mother.

The Bishops are planning to issue a Pastoral Letter on the Blessed Mother in the near future. A special committee is now working on the text which will be submitted to the body of Bishops at the spring meeting in April.

With gratitude for your interest and with cordial good wishes, I remain

Sincerely …

No doubt the Bishops’ Conference regularly received letters from religious women on many topics. However, neither letters nor the changing role of women in society and in the Church led the Bishops or the theologians to formally seek out even one woman’s voice during the writing of Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith. 107
CHAPTER CONCLUSIONS.

The U.S. Bishops’ earlier post-Conciliar Pastoral Letter *The Church in Our Day* did not address the crisis in Marian devotion; Pastoral Letters from other national bodies of Bishops varied in their approaches to the question.

The Mariological Society of America engaged in theological reflection on “the silence about Mary” while the number of popular Marian periodicals dwindled. The Bishops continued to hear from their people their concerns about the seemingly — diminished role of Mary in Catholic life.

The National Shrine Board — after consulting a number of prominent theologians — organized Cardinal Carberry’s request to the Administrative Board of the NCCB for a Pastoral Letter on Mary. Despite the hesitations of Cardinal Dearden, the Board gave tentative approval to a Letter, providing it should closely follow *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII. The debates about Mary during the Council were still alive — among both Bishops (“Post-Conciliar weaknesses cannot be strengthened by pre-Conciliar measures”) and among theologians (as was evidenced in their varied suggestions for the proposed Pastoral Letter).

Cardinal Carberry gathered a like-minded group of Bishops and theologians. The Bishops would be responsible for a brief, simple first part — directed to the people. The theologians, led by Father Carroll, would produce the scholarly second part.

The time came for the theologians as a group to continue the work on the main part of the text of the Pastoral Letter.
The 1973 Pastoral Letter “Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith”
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Chapter 3 – The Work of the Theologians and the Bishops

“Catholics have reacted two ways:

first, in a period of breakups and uncertainties,
the priority has become to safeguard the deposit of revelation and maintain
the inner cohesion of the institution;

and second, in a period in which the Church explicitly recognizes
that it is really and deeply affected by the developments in its environment,
the Church must acknowledge that in its doctrines and practices
it can no longer lead an abstract existence above and beyond history.”

This chapter traces the theologians’ work through four drafts of the Pastoral Letter on Mary and the many *modi* of individual Bishops to the various drafts; additionally considered are the influences of other NCCB matters — such as reaction to the January 1973 *Roe v. Wade* decision — on the attention and priority given to the Marian Pastoral Letter; and the final vote of the U.S. Bishops.

3.1 “Draft A” — March 1972

In late March 1972, Father Carroll finished writing “Draft A” which was forwarded to all the members — Bishops and theologians — of the *ad hoc* committee.

“Draft A”, less than thirty pages long as first proposed by Father Carrole, was composed of a brief introduction, and was followed by four main parts:

**Introduction**

**Part One: Biblical Portrait of Mary**

**Part Two: The Church’s Understanding of Mary Since Biblical Times**

**Part Three: Our Lady in Catholic Life and Devotion**
Part Four: Our Lady in Christian Unity

(A final section of “General Observations in Conclusion” was intended, but not included in “Draft A”.)

3.1a Review of “Draft A”

- The Introduction voiced both concern and confidence: ‘concern over the confusion about the Blessed Virgin’s place in Catholic doctrine and devotion” and “confidence that the correct understanding of ‘the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in the mystery of Christ and the Church’” — the title of Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII — “will strengthen faith and inspire joyful veneration of Mary, mother and model of the Church.”

- Part One was a “Biblical Portrait of Mary”. Again taking a cue from Lumen Gentium, it focused on Old Testament images of the Chosen People as the “poor and lowly” which looked ahead to Mary, and on the “time of fulfillment” when the Woman of faith received the Word of God in her heart and conceived Him in her flesh, particularly as narrated in the Gospel of Luke.

The “biblical portrait” included the “difficult sayings” from Christ’s public life which praised Mary’s faith; her “lifelong pilgrimage”; Mary’s cooperation in her Son’s sacrificial death; her prayer made with the Apostles awaiting the Spirit; and the “promise of her Magnificat — ‘All generations will call me blessed, because He that is mighty hath done great things for me.’”

Father Carroll recalled that “it was very important to begin with the Scriptures…”

There had been a rediscovery of Scripture by Catholics… and we knew how important it was to speak to our Protestant brothers and sisters on a Biblical basis. This was behind all our thinking in the Biblical part. Also, we used terms like “In the history of Israel…”, because it came into our minds that our Jewish friends would be reading this."
• Part Two was titled “The Church’s Understanding of Mary Since Biblical Times”. Reflecting *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII, it treated the topics of Mary as the “New Eve”; the Virgin Birth and her Perpetual Virginity; Mary as the Mother of God; her great holiness and explanations of her Immaculate Conception (“only by the grace of God”) and her Assumption (“a sign of hope and comfort, the image of the Church in perfection”).

Part Two also dealt with the Church’s understanding of the meaning of the term “Mediatrix” and Mary’s Spiritual Motherhood — “our Blessed Mother” being “Americans’ favorite popular title for Mary”.

• Part Three, “Our Lady in Catholic Life and Devotion” first traced Catholic belief in Mary’s intercession and her place in the Communion of Saints. Then it addressed the situation in which “Marian devotions have waned” in the post-Conciliar Church in the United States: “the recent confusion about our Lady …the experience of the last few years…the distress of our people over the loss of devotion.”

This third part also looked to *Lumen Gentium* no. 66–67 on “The Cult of the Blessed Virgin in the Church”, to foster the practices and exercises of piety, so that the People of God, suffering “a malaise with respect to the commemoration of Mary” may gain “strength from our Blessed Mother through public devotions, prayers and sacrifices.”

• Part Four of “Draft A” — “Our Lady and Christian Unity” — saw the “ecumenical steps toward dialogue” as a positive sign and noted that “common veneration and imitation of the Virgin Mary has been increasing.”

Making note also of some of the differences and difficulties, the draft, in the spirit of *Lumen Gentium* no. 69, “advocate(d) openness and prayerfulness so that we Christians might all experience Mary “model of Christian faith” as also “the Mother of Christian unity.”

Reactions to “Draft A” were to be shared at a meeting of the *ad hoc* committee scheduled for May 22–23 in Washington, D.C.
3.1b The *ad hoc* Committee’s Responses to “Draft A”

Monsignor Falls, an *ad hoc* committee member who would not be able to attend the Washington, DC meeting in May, was the first to respond to “Draft A”, in a letter to Father Carroll dated April 8, 1972. 

I have read your first draft of the proposed Pastoral Letter on Our Lady and I feel that you have touched on the important elements that should be included … the Church’s Marian teaching… recommendations for devotion… and Mary’s role in ecumenism.

While he “agree(d) that the explanation of Marian doctrine and devotion should be biblical, patristic and conciliar, and I feel that you have done that beautifully in your draft,” he did however question the order of the topics presented. Monsignor Falls indicated that “a summary of the history of Marian devotion in this country, from beginning to the present time, should be included”; that inclusion would lead, he wrote, to a “somewhat different order.”

The other members of the *ad hoc* committee met in Washington later in May 1972. According to a 32-page transcription of an audio tape of the meeting, there were discussions about six major theological aspects of “Draft A” (listed here according to the order in which the topics appeared in the draft:)

- Bishop Baum questioned the place in which Mary’s Divine Motherhood was treated in “Draft A” — “after the scriptural affirmations about our Lady, (instead of) the classical first place it has maintained in theology.” Father Carroll responded that the emergence of the title, “Mother of God”, was “later in the Church’s history.” Father Kugelman pointed out that he thought “most Mariologists would still start with the Divine Maternity”, but said he liked “the way Father Carroll has done it. This was the historical way.” Father Jelly called it “a more genetic approach also.” Father Carroll then added that he felt this was also a “more ecumenical” way. The question would continue to be a topic for the *ad hoc* committee and among several of the Bishops who responded to the drafts that followed.
• The question of “Mary as Mediatrix” was discussed. Father Kugelman admitted that the term “has indeed been productive of difficulties, ecumenically for example”. Father Carroll pointed out that “many people felt that the Council cashiered the term and concept of Mary as ‘Mediatrix’” and said he was anxious to show that this was not so. Bishop Baum pointed out that the draft identified Mary as Mediatrix with Mary as spiritual mother, and Father Carroll affirmed that such was his intention. There seemed to be “general approval” of this.

• Bishop Baum raised the question of how pessimistically the Pastoral Letter would address the decline in devotions. Cardinal Carberry said he was convinced of “the much greater value of taking a positive tack with regard to the whole matter of devotion to Mary.” Monsignor McDonough spoke of the need to revitalize the Rosary. Father Jelly said he hoped the Pastoral Letter would reach those priests who “have not been providing for their people … the rosary and other devotions.” Monsignor McDonough said that he was convinced that in the era of increased exegesis “our priests simply do not know how to preach about Our Lady… Devotion has fallen off among priests and sisters; the lay people are the innocent victims.” At the end of the discussion, Cardinal Carberry suggested that such phrases as “fallen into disuse”, “dramatically declined” and “dropped off sharply” might be changed to give “a more optimistic, a more hopeful effect rather than a pessimistic one.”

• Bishop Maloney expressed concern about forms of new devotions. He agreed with “Draft A” that they should be encouraged, but wanted to add the caution that these meet with the approval of the hierarchy and the Holy See. “Otherwise we have all kinds of new devotions, new prayer cards, and so forth (with) no approval,” he said. After discussion, the group came to the conclusion that rather than discourage new devotions, “it was simply better (to include) the statement that ‘We remind true lovers of Our Lady of the danger of empty credulity… and so forth.’”

• Father O’Connell noted that absence of any references to the lay apostolate. “We are calling on the laity to do their part in the Church, to be responsible, to take part in the apostolate. The Mother of God should be the first of all. She should be the model of
the Christian apostolate … her prayers, her sacrifice, her labor. Her task was to do the will of God.” The *ad hoc* committee felt “that the women’s lib group will not be satisfied with this part. There is resentment on the part of the women’s liberation group about Mary as a model of passive values.” Father Carroll granted that “indeed, more might be added about this.”

- Regarding ecumenism, Father O’Connell suggested that, conscious of the ecumenical implications of what they, as the Pastoral Letter’s authors, might write, they remove and avoid phrases such as “salvation in Mary.”

At the end of the meeting, Cardinal Carberry mentioned the need to consider a title for the Pastoral Letter and a short introductory salutation as well. Quickly discussing a timetable for the letter, the Bishops at the meeting agreed that the final draft of the Pastoral Letter should be available to all the Bishops for consideration before their November 1972 national meeting, when a vote on the letter would be taken and the letter promulgated.7

### 3.1c A Suggestion About Including Women

One week after the *ad hoc* committee meeting, Father O’Connell sent a letter to Father Carroll8 as a follow-up to his comments on the lay apostolate:

> The only point that I consider to be of major importance is the need of “updating” the document so as to include some recognition of the role of women in society today. Vatican II alludes to the question in several places… without getting down to any specific conclusions. Perhaps some general statements of this nature are all that can be included in the Pastoral on our Lady. However, I fear that if the question is ignored completely, we will hear cries of “archaic”, “unaware of modern problems”, “written from an ivory tower”, etc.

Father O’Connell went on to make a specific recommendation about including women in the process of writing the Pastoral Letter:
It might be well to get the opinions of some knowledgeable women on the role of Mary with relation to the problems of modern women. These women consultants, I feel, should not be only theologians, but also some who are aware of the social and cultural dimensions of the subject.

There is no record of a response to Father O’Connell on this subject, perhaps because there was at this time a question about whether the Pastoral Letter would be brought to completion and if it should ever be presented to the U.S. Bishops.

3.2 “Draft B”- July 1972

The second of the four “drafts” of the Pastoral Letter was scheduled to be sent to all the Bishops of the United States; however, some officials at the NCCB indicated that they did not think the work on the Pastoral Letter should continue.

3.2a An Attempt to “Shelve” the Letter?

Father McDonough had written to Cardinal Carberry, stating that “I personally feel (Father Carroll) is involved in so many things that he will never meet the (Pastoral Letter’s) deadline. At the same time, I am convinced that he is the only priest to compose the Pastoral.”

In response, Cardinal Carberry wrote to Father Carroll, informing him that “I will speak with Bishop Bernardin … in order to ask him to place at your disposal secretarial help, someone to whom you could dictate … and (who) would prepare your manuscript and then retype it accordingly.” As it happened, the office at the National Shrine provided the typist and the first copies of “Draft B” were forwarded to both Father Carroll and, at the NCCB secretariat, Father Thomas Kelly, O.P.

Father Kelly had been hired by Bishop Bernardin to assist him and the new NCCB President, John Cardinal Krol. Cardinal Dearden’s term had ended in November 1971 and Cardinal Krol, the Archbishop of Philadelphia, succeeded him. Cardinal Krol had finished second to Cardinal Dearden in the 1966 voting for President and was at that time
elected to a term as conference vice-president. It was said of Cardinal Krol that “he did not go through the same conversion at the Council that Archbishop Dearden did. He continued to have ‘a reputation as a conservative churchman who runs a tight ship.’”13 Cardinal Krol’s administrative style was different than Cardinal Dearden’s,14 as Cardinal Krol himself admitted:

I expressed my philosophy of administration in these terms (pointing to a plaque): “I would rather you do it yourself.” That is the responsibility of leadership, to train people to make decisions … I tell them “You have to make the decisions and if you’re wrong I’ll rap your knuckles, that’s all”… Once a decision has been made, a decision has been made. And that settles it.15

When Father Kelly16 received a copy of “Draft B” he sent an urgent memorandum to Bishop Bernardin on June 30, 1972:

I have (previously) expressed misgivings about the technical aspects of this document. I had not seen it then, but you directed that it be examined closely and redone if necessary.

Last night I read the letter through. It is in bad shape, not only technically, but substantively as well. With no previous experience in the preparation of such documents, I feel certain that it cannot be distributed to the bishops as a draft. It needs to be reworked from beginning to end. At present it is a very interesting report of thoughts exchanged by theologians and bishops. It is not a letter from bishops to faithful.

It is also clear that some parts of the document are missing, e.g. some kind of preface or introduction stating the purpose of the document.

There are notes indicating that the ad hoc committee wishes certain additions incorporated. This has not been done.

I am at a loss what to do … May I have your comment on this situation. Mr. Shaw17 agrees that this document is in no sense worthy of submission to the Bishops for modi and that it
must be entirely rewritten… He joins me in judging it useless as a draft of a pastoral letter. An early approach to Cardinal Carberry, who is recovering from a recent operation, would appear necessary.\textsuperscript{18}

Four days later, with the future of the Pastoral Letter on Mary in doubt, Bishop Bernardin wrote to Cardinal Carberry\textsuperscript{19} asking him to “give me whatever directions are necessary before we undertake this project.” Cardinal Carberry’s response was to compose a cover letter to accompany “Draft B”, informing each U.S. Bishop that

the \textit{ad hoc} committee would like to point out that much work still needs to be done on the treatise concerning Our Blessed Lady before final submission to the body of bishops. It was felt that it would be well to send the substance of our study to the bishops for their review and to wait until the final draft stage and at that time revise the English of the letter, the shortening of paragraphs, chapter titles, subtitles, uniformity of references, citations, and other items which would come under the general reference of editorial refinement\textsuperscript{20}

Despite the objections of Father Kelly and other members of the NCCB staff leadership, “Draft B” was sent to the Bishops with Cardinal Carberry’s cover letter. Although there are no records of Cardinal Krol’s involvement at this crucial moment, Father Carroll has recalled that “Cardinal Carberry wasn’t pursuing this idea of a letter on his own. The Bishops’ new president, Cardinal Krol, was involved.”\textsuperscript{21}

And as Cardinal Krol had once said, “Once a decision has been made, a decision has been made. That settles it…” The work of the \textit{ad hoc} committee continued. All the Bishops of the U.S. were about to see the committee’s first draft of a Pastoral Letter on Mary.

\textbf{3.2b “Draft B” — Review}

Although it was definitely in need of “editorial refinement”, as Cardinal Carberry had said, “Draft B” of the Pastoral Letter on Mary — which had no working title — was sent to all the U.S. Bishops in late July, 1972.
Mary, the U.S. Bishops, and the Decade of Silence:

The now 49-page, hand-typed and mimeographed revision of the earlier “Draft A” had begun to take the form of the eventual Pastoral Letter.

It was sent to the Bishops with Cardinal Carberry’s cover letter, but with no “Introduction”; hence, the first page the Bishops saw carried the title “Our Lady in the Bible”. At least a few of the Bishops’ responses indicated that they thought “Our Lady in the Bible” was the title of the entire letter.

Nevertheless, “Our Lady in the Bible” was the title only of Part One, the first eleven pages of “Draft B”- a treatment beginning with Galatians 4:4 and continuing on to the Annunciation narrative and “the Old Testament announcements delivered by angels”. The treatment of Biblical images such as “Daughter of Zion” and other Marian typologies in Part One came from ad hoc committee member Passionist Father Kugelman, a scripture scholar.

Approximately one-third of “Our Lady in the Bible” looked at the Old Testament; one-half focused on the Gospel of Luke; and a brief one-sixth considered the Gospel of John.

Part Two — with the difficult title “Development of the Church’s Understanding of the Virgin Mary in Christian History” — was six pages long. Here the emphasis was on the Mary-Church parallels. Part Two said that “the story of Mary as the Church has come to see her is at the same time the record of the Church’s own self-discovery.” Mary’s exemplarity as virgin and mother; Mary as the “new Eve”; the Virgin Birth; and the Perpetual Virginity of Mary were all treated.

In a rather disjointed way, at this point in “Draft B” (and in no subsequent drafts) came a quote from Roger Schutz of the Calvinist community of Taize, declaring that celibacy was “a folly of the Gospel in man’s view but the heralding of the coming of the kingdom of God” and that “celibacy will animate the Church of God in its unique vocation of being the salt of the earth.” At this time in its writing, there was no other place in the letter to reflect on priestly and religious life.

Part Three — alternately called “The Holiness of Mary” and “The Blessedness of Mary” — was seven pages in length. It explored the theological meaning of the Immaculate Conception (as Mary’s “initial”
or “beginning” holiness) and the Assumption (“Mary as a figure of the Church as perfected through union with Christ”).

In “Draft B” the history of the title “Mother of God” followed, according to its order in the historical development of the Church’s understanding of Mary. This would prove to be a troublesome order for some of the Bishops who would respond.

The last paragraph of the section mentioned that “many other familiar titles for Mary are rooted in the title Mother of God” but followed with only a very brief explanation that “Seat of Wisdom means the resting place of wisdom made flesh, of incarnate wisdom.” No other examples from the Litany of Loreto were mentioned.

The untitled Part Four was actually about two intertwined subjects: Mary as Mediatrix and Mary as Spiritual Mother. The draft said that since the early twenties “mediatrix” came to be used more and more to describe Mary’s union with her Son’s saving work and that the term had become common in popular piety. The text explained that “the Council generally preferred other expressions as more helpful ecumenically and pastorally.” “Draft B” devoted several pages to Mary as “Mediatrix”.

In treating Mary as “Spiritual Mother”, the draft used what it called “the beautiful image of St. Pius X: ‘Mary in carrying the Christ-Child in her womb may be said to have carried also those whose lives were joined to Christ.’” Otherwise, the Spiritual Motherhood section relied heavily on the Fathers, such as Saint Augustine’s “More blessed was Mary in receiving the faith of Christ than in conceiving the flesh of Christ,” all further showing Mary as a type of the Church.

Part Five, “Mary in Our Life”, included three important topics — Mary’s intercession, devotion to Mary and ecumenism.

Giving a definition for Mary’s “intercession”, “Draft B” said that the word intercession was ancient in its use by the Church and has meant that the blessed who are one with the Risen Christ are still interested in us, that they can and do pray for us — not as “go-betweens” but to assist us by their prayers.
Mary, the U.S. Bishops, and the Decade of Silence:

The crisis in devotion to Mary was treated straightforwardly: “The recent confusion about our Lady has been most manifest in the area of devotion” and was evidenced by a long quotation from Jaroslav Pelikan about the rate and depth of change in the devotional life of Catholics, “a surprise to everyone.” He stated that “I myself had thought such things as Marian devotion and tabernacle piety were so deep in the life of the Church it would take a catastrophe to eradicate them” Dr. Pelikan’s comments appeared only in “Draft B”.

The draft listed both the renewed liturgy and “an amazingly rich variety of extra-liturgical devotional forms” — especially the rosary — as sources for reanimating devotional life.

Part Six on “The Blessed Virgin and Ecumenism” stated that through the long history of Reformation and Counter-Reformation “excesses abounded on both sides”; but in “this modern era of friendly relations between Catholics and members of other Christian Churches,” it “(took) its cue from the Council’s careful and restrained use of language.”

Holding that “no sound ecumenism can ignore the matter of Mary”, “Draft B” praised Brother Max Thurian’s book on Mary of the Gospels: *Mary Mother of the Lord Figure of the Church* and quoted Karl Barth’s assessment of the Roman Church as “that church of man who prompted by the grace of God cooperates with grace and merits salvation.” Both Thurian and Barth were to remain in the final text of the Pastoral Letter.

“The Record of American Catholic Devotion to Our Lady” was a three-page chronological treatment of Marian names and Mary’s patronage of the nation, ending with a brief history of — almost an advertisement for — the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception.

This “Record” would survive in succeeding drafts virtually untouched. The main parts of the Pastoral Letter, however, would undergo many changes, based primarily on the modi from Bishops across the country.

3.2c The Bishops’ First Replies: Modi on “Draft B”

Cardinal Carberry, chairman of the ad hoc committee, had sent “Draft B” to all the U.S. Bishops on July 24, 1972.22 Within days and throughout
The next month, individual *modi* with general observations and specific recommendations were sent to either Cardinal Carberry in Saint Louis or the NCCB offices in Washington, D.C.\(^{23}\)

Forty-one Bishops — approximately 20 percent of the U.S. Bishops — replied in writing to “Draft B”; from the content of these replies — based on each Bishop’s indication whether or nor he thought the writing of the Letter should be continued — nineteen could be characterized as “favorable”; another nineteen as “unfavorable”. Three were basically non-committal. Ironically, the U.S. Bishops who replied were as evenly divided over “Draft B” as the Fathers at the Second Vatican Council had been over the inclusion of the Marian schema into *Lumen Gentium*.

*Positive Responses:*

Among the “positive” replies, Archbishop Byrne of Dubuque called the letter “*very necessary*”\(^{24}\) and Bishop Begin of Oakland characterized his response as “*very positive.*”\(^{25}\) Bishop Waters of Raleigh found the draft of the letter “*very fundamental and well done*”\(^{26}\) and Bishop Morkovsky wrote that “*the substance is admirable.*”\(^{27}\) Kansas City (Missouri) Bishop Helmsing thought that “*readers should be encouraged to proceed prayerfully and studiously*” through the doctrinal portion of the letter. Bishop Helmsing was among the very few Bishops who spoke to the letter’s primary objective; he stated that

> the practical application of the doctrinal section to the present realities of the Church in the United States is excellently outlined. This latter part should do much to promote devotion to Mary. The hard work of the *periti* is evident in the draft.\(^{28}\)

In all, the positive replies ranged from that of Bishop Lynch, auxiliary of Raleigh, who wrote that he “hope(d) it is published as is … worthy of a papal encyclical”\(^{29}\) to Bishop Schexnayder of Lafayette, Louisiana’s determination that the letter would be “quite necessary for our young priests”\(^{30}\) to that of Nashville’s Bishop Durick, who simply called it “*timely*”\(^{31}\).

Nevertheless, among the nineteen positive responses, several Bishops expressed concerns about the letter’s length and style. Archbishop Byrne found the scriptural and doctrinal parts very necessary, but expressed
the opinion that a pastoral letter needed “a section for average American Catholics.” Bishop Morkovsky noted that the draft “needs style … and is rather long” and Bishop Durick noted that the draft was “too long and too complex.”

**Negative responses:**

The nineteen negative replies to “Draft B” also focused on both style and content. Archbishop Alter of Cincinnati called it “entirely too long” and feared that, as such, it “would receive inadequate attention.” Juneau’s Bishop Hurley wrote that “as a treatise, yes; but as a pastoral, it misses the mark.” Bishop O’Donnell of Madison replied that a pastoral letter “should touch people; as it now stands, this draft is an abstract or a monograph.” Bishop O’Donnell offered several suggestions:

> The middle section is rather long and dry, reads like a theology book of some years ago. At best, this could be tailored a great deal.

> The last section picks up because it is more immediate to the life of the church now by referring to liturgy, devotion, authors and developments today. It is not as abstract and strictly scholarly as the previous section.

> I would prefer even a far more ‘existential’ approach to the whole letter.

Bishop Mugavero of Brooklyn bluntly called the draft “unconvincing and uninteresting” and Baltimore auxiliary Bishop Spence found it “an archaic and repetitious review of the past.”

The most negative of the responses came from Bishop Breitenbeck of Grand Rapids, who replied not to Cardinal Carberry but to Bishop Bernardin: “I have serious reservations about publishing this material, even if some changes are made.” Uniquely, Bishop Breitenbeck had “a group” in the diocese “review the draft and submit observations.” According to the group’s report,

> the critical reading of this proposed Pastoral Letter was a distressing and depressing experience. Whatever its purpose
may be, there are, in our opinion, cogent reasons why it should never be published.

The “cogent reasons” were explained only in one sentence:

Of the several elements contributing to our unfavorable reaction to this Pastoral, the most serious, I (sic) believe, is the presence therein of theological statements and implications which indicate that the authors were, consciously or unconsciously, disregarding conclusions of our best theological and scriptural scholars on certain issues.

The Grand Rapids’ group did not list the “theological statements and implications” to which it objected, nor did it specifically mention any of the “disregard(ed) conclusions” of theological and scripture scholars.

The strongly-opposed reply from the Grand Rapids diocese foreshadowed the eventual negative vote from all the Bishops of Region VI (the arch/dioceses in the states of Michigan and Ohio).

3.2d Presidents of Mariological Society and Catholic Theological Societies

Earlier in the summer of 1972, Father Juniper Carol, O.F.M., the President of the Mariological Society of America, had written to Cardinal Carberry, asking to read the final draft of the Pastoral Letter and offering the “unofficial” assistance of the M.S.A. and his own help.43

Cardinal Carberry responded on July 19, grateful for the offer of help; he mentioned that the final draft would not be available for perhaps some months, but he assured Father Carol that a copy would be sent to him at that time. On August 3, Father Carol expressed “many, many thanks for your willingness to allow me to read the text … before it is submitted to the final approval of the American Bishops.”

Many members of the ad hoc committee were long-time members of the Mariological Society of America. Father Eamon Carroll admitted
there was no secrecy about it. From the beginning, never did anyone, Carberry or anyone else say, “You’re not supposed to talk about this.” I could consult theologians and scholars; I could ask their advice. There were others in the Mariological Society (of America), in which I was so deeply involved by then, who were available and offering suggestions.44

Later, the President of the Catholic Theological Society of America — Father John H Wright, S.J., of the Jesuit School of Theology in Berkeley — wrote to Cardinal Carberry that

a theologian of the Midwest who was asked by his Bishop to prepare a review of “Draft B” has written to me suggesting that the Catholic Theological Society of America, perhaps in conjunction with the Catholic Biblical Association, could help in some way to insure that this Pastoral Letter could have the desired effect… This is a sensitive area… If you would like to consult the theologians of the CTSA, I would be very happy to provide this service for you… You are entirely free to accept or reject the suggestions that we might offer.45

Cardinal Carberry responded three weeks later that he would be happy to send the next draft whenever it was available for Father Wright’s personal reading and reflection. “Whatever suggestions you may have will be deeply appreciated by all of us.” But the Cardinal went on to inform Father Wright:

We have been blessed in having on our Committee Father Eamon Carroll, O.Carm., the distinguished Mariologist; Father Richard Kugelman, C.P., who at the present time is president of the Catholic Biblical Association; and also the Reverend Hugh O’Connell, C.SS.R., a distinguished Dogmatician of the Redemptorist community; Father Frederick Jelly, O.P. another distinguished Mariologist; and Monsignor Thomas Falls of Philadelphia who is known for his interest in Mariology and patristic studies…

On our Committee of Bishops, Cardinal Manning and Cardinal Medeiros lead the list, together with Bishop John Dougherty of Newark, an outstanding Biblical scholar;
and Bishop David Maloney of Wichita; and finally, Archbishop William Baum, the newly named Archbishop of Washington.46

In these responses to the presidents of national groups of theologians, Cardinal Carberry seemed satisfied with the consultants he had chosen.

3.3 “Draft C” — February 1973

Of all the drafts, “Draft C” would take the longest time to produce and to forward to the Bishops. In addition to the modi, the ad hoc committee had to deal with other situations somewhat beyond their control.

3.3a Ad Hoc Committee Meeting of September 1972

The ad hoc committee for the Pastoral Letter on Mary met again in Washington for two days, on September 9 and 10 to help prepare “Draft C”. According to the secretary’s minutes of the meeting,47 there were five major topics of discussion:

- “Unanimous approval was given by all present to (committee member) Archbishop Manning’s proposal that ‘Draft C’ of the Pastoral be published in the form:

  1) Pulpit Letter of the Bishops; 2) Text; and 3) Synopsis. Cardinal Carberry asked a committee of three to work together on the Pulpit Letter: Archbishop Manning, Bishop Dougherty and Father Carroll.

- “The Bishops’ modi concerning ‘Draft B’ were distributed and discussed in light of completing ‘Draft C’. Generally speaking, their observations raised the following questions about the text: too lengthy?; too theological (technical)?; should the order be inverted so that the pastoral section precede the biblical?; should not the Divine Motherhood be treated first among Mary’s prerogatives?; and, are some additions in order such as some reference to religious and priestly vocations, the family rosary, or the current problem of abortion?”
• “The committee discussed first of all the question of order for ‘Draft C’. Father Carroll, while conceeding that the text might begin more pastorally with the section on Mary’s spiritual motherhood, considered it better to start with the biblical which is a chronological approach and so provides the source of the development of Marian devotion and doctrine in the Church. Bishop Baum thought the problem would be resolved by the fact that the total Pastoral would begin with the Pulpit Letter … to make it more meaningful to the person in the pew. Following further discussion, such as the need to explain technical terms, it was agreed that the present order for ‘Draft C’ be retained.”

• “Then the committee addressed itself to the question of Chapter Titles and sub-titles for ‘Draft C’. A lengthy discussion followed… For the sake of some brevity, all that seemed to be agreed upon in this context will be listed here in schematic form:

  Title of Chapter I: Our Lady in the Bible
      Sub-titles: Gospel of Luke
                Gospel of John

  Title of Chapter II: Development in the Church’s
                      Understanding in the Mystery of the
                      Virgin Mary
      Possible sub-titles: Type of the Church
                           Bride of Christ Virgin-Birth
                           Perpetual Virginity

  Title of Chapter III: The Blessedness of Mary
      Sub-titles: Her Holiness
                 Her Assumption
                 “Mother of God”
                 Mediatrix and Spiritual Mother

  Title of Chapter IV: Mary’s Intercession — Place in the
                      Communion of Saints

  Title of Chapter V: Devotion to Mary

  Title of Chapter VI: The Blessed Virgin and Ecumenism
Title of Chapter VII: The Record of American Catholic Devotion to Mary

- “Cardinal Carberry asked Father Kugelman to continue to work with Father Carroll on Chapter I and Father Jelly to collaborate on the documentation of the other chapters. It was agreed that the New American Bible would be used generally unless another version would be better in a given instance in which case note would be made of it. The new target date agreed upon was that the final draft might be in the hands of the Bishops (and) final approbation be proclaimed on August 15, 1973.”

Once again, this revised “target date” proved to be somewhat unrealistic, for a number of reasons. The actual promulgation date was three months later.

3.3b Modi from the Vatican

In August of 1972, Cardinal Carberry had written to Bishop Bernardin, wondering whether “it might be helpful if Cardinal Wright were able to look over the Pastoral Letter. … Perhaps you could send me an extra copy of the Pastoral Letter’s latest draft, and I would be able to send it in my own name to him. Perhaps he might have excellent suggestions for us.”

Bishop Bernardin agreed: “It is not unusual for the conference to invite Cardinal Wright’s opinion.”

Three weeks later, Cardinal Carberry received a confidential letter from Archbishop Luigi Raimondi, the Apostolic Delegate in the United States, with the news that

the Cardinal Secretary of State has studied with great satisfaction the proposed text of the Pastoral Letter of the American Hierarchy on the Blessed Mother … The proposed Pastoral, based as it is upon sound scriptural and patristic foundations, is especially beneficial in our own times.
However, “in the spirit of cordial collaboration … the Cardinal (Secretary of State) thought that it would be opportune to seek the advice of a respected expert who could offer some suggestions concerning the proposed text … in a confidential and friendly manner.” It was unclear whether the “respected expert” was indeed Cardinal Wright — or perhaps some other scholar who, at the time, might have been working at the Vatican on Paul VI’s upcoming Apostolic Exhortation on Marian devotion.

In any case, the Vatican’s suggestions (translated from the Italian text) were four-fold:

a) “that the Divine Motherhood of Mary be considered prior to her Sanctity, Assumption and Virginity;”

b) “that consideration be given to the treatment of Mary, ‘Mother of the Church’, as proclaimed by Pope Paul VI. This proclamation has doctrinal value even though it is an act of ordinary personal teaching authority;”

c) “that Mary, ‘the Model of the Church’, the exemplar of Christian virtues, merits greater attention both because of these virtues, and as the ecumenical value of such a treatment.”

“In the midst of the present thrust toward the vindication of the rights of women in various areas, the image of Mary, especially her virtues and womanly qualities, are not stressed enough in the draft. In her, the hidden woman, shine brightly the very virtues needed for today, for example, her humility, obedience, patience, virginity and docility.”

“For some women, including even religious women, Mary is seen as a model of virtues of another age, an age which has passed away. A recall, however, to the present need of Mary’s virtues for womanhood in the United States is a matter of great importance.”

d) “In the proposed Pastoral Letter, reference is made to the appearance of Our Lady in various places in the world. It is suggested that when speaking of the apparitions at LaSalette and Knock, care be used lest it seem that the Episcopal Conference of the USA would be approving these apparitions. The Holy See, as yet, has not authentically commented on them.”
There is no record of the *ad hoc* committee discussing the points as raised, but the final draft would show: a) that the order in which Divine Motherhood was treated was not changed; b) that treatment of “Mother of the Church” was added; c) that the *ad hoc* committee shared the concerns about “women today”, making some attempt to address the issue further in the text, without however emphasizing Mary’s “docility”; and d) LaSalette was included in the Pastoral Letter; Knock was not.

### 3.3c Review of “Draft C”

The content of “Draft C” concentrated on what the *ad hoc* committee had come to call “the text” of the Letter — to differentiate it from both the “Pulpit Letter/Introduction” at the Pastoral Letter’s beginning and the “Synopsis” which was to be at its end. The text was lengthened only a bit, from 49 pages (“Draft B”) to 54 pages (“Draft C”). The structure of the Letter changed; “Draft B’s” Chapter 5 (“Mary in Our Life”) became two chapters in “Draft C” (“Mary’s Intercession” and “Devotion to Mary”).

The substantive changes included theological points, such as:

- the removal in “Draft C” of an article tracing the history of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception from Saint Augustine through Saint Anselm, Saint Bernard and Saint Thomas Aquinas to Duns Scotus;

- the removal of the treatment of the phrase “His body is present to us”: “We have customarily used the phrase ‘Real Presence’ for the sacramental presence of the Body and Blood of the Risen Christ. But there are other equally ‘real’ presences of the Risen Lord…” so as not to diminish Eucharistic belief.

- eliminating the phrase “recalling the obsessive fascination with the famous ‘Fatima letter’ that was not to be opened before 1960” from the section on “Devotion” dealing with apparitions.

Perhaps the biggest theological challenge to “Draft C” came from the Catholic press: *America* magazine reported in its January 27, 1973
edition (which has printed before the January 22 Roe v. Wade decision of the U.S. Supreme Court) that

The Roman Catholic Bishops of the United States are planning to issue a pastoral letter on the subject of Mary … One can only guess at the concerns that made them feel a pastoral was necessary, but doctrinal orthodoxy seems to be the most likely one.

*America* feared that “the Bishops could create several pastoral problems, and aggravate others.” The article warned that

They could either manifest confidence in our theologians or create new distances and tensions… There is reason to doubt whether such openness to theological inquiry will be present.

The magazine stated that Raymond Brown’s research on “the virginal conception of Jesus is known to have upset” Cardinal Carberry. Further, it feared that “the pastoral could be an exercise in ecumenical isolationism.”

This conflict in the popular Catholic press — which reflected many post-Conciliar tensions — could have escalated, had not the simultaneous news of the Supreme Court decision taken focus from it.

### 3.3d The Impact of Roe v. Wade

At the same time the *ad hoc* committee was preparing “Draft C” for the Bishops’ consideration and reading *America’s* forebodings about the Pastoral Letter, the United States Supreme Court’s decision *Roe v. Wade* required the immediate and full attention of the Bishops’ Conference.

For a short time before January 22, 1973 — and for months thereafter — special meetings of Bishops in Washington and in their provincial groups caused many other issues to be put aside. On January 26, Cardinal Carberry wrote to the members of the *ad hoc* committee proposing that a “new section” be added to the current draft; “Mary and the Sacredness of Life” would address “the crime of abortion” and “the Supreme Court decision”. He asked Archbishop Manning, Bishop Baum
and Father O’Connell to draft the addition. In “Draft D”, the content of their statement appears, not in a separate section, but incorporated into Chapter 5, “Mary the Mother of the Church”; where it would eventually appear under the sub-title “Mary and Family Life”, as no. 132: “Reverence for human life as sacred from the beginning …(means) abortion arouses in the Christian the same horror as the slaughter of the innocents” and

...The Blessed Mother protects human life today from the moment of conception through birth (the beginning of our pilgrimage of faith), until all mankind realizes its goal in the beatific vision. Abortion, the deliberate killing of an unborn fetus, is a heinous crime and a serious sin... No court, no matter how prestigious, can make acceptable what is obviously totally opposed to the Laws of God and the best interest of our society (no. 136).

Virtually every secretariat, office and committee of the NCCB felt the extra demand for work immediately after Roe v. Wade. “Because of this,” Cardinal Carberry wrote to the ad hoc committee,55 “we will have to cancel the proposed meeting of February 28 to March 1 in Saint Louis.”

Cardinal Carberry anticipated that the responses to “Draft C”, which had been requested by February 20, 1973, would be late in coming. Because he likewise anticipated another delay in meeting the timetable for the Pastoral Letter, he formally requested and received approval for a change from the Bishops’ usual voting procedure on Pastoral Letters. After consulting the NCCB leadership and staff, he informed the U.S. Bishops that the vote on the Pastoral Letter — now tentatively titled Behold Thy Mother — would be taken at their Spring “Regional Meetings” instead of during a Fall General Meeting, as was usually done. Cardinal Carberry also planned that an ad hoc committee member (either a Bishop or a theologian) would be present at each Regional Meeting to “assist the Bishops”57 of each Region during their discussion and their preparation for the final vote.

In summary, Roe v. Wade changed the content of, the timetable for and the Bishops’ manner of voting on the Pastoral Letter.
3.3e The Bishops’ Second Set of Modi

Sixty-four Bishops — twenty three more than responded to “Draft B” — replied to “Draft C”, sending modi to Cardinal Carberry, chairman of the ad hoc committee.

Based on the content of their replies, the Bishops’ responses were very favorable: fifty-two Bishops indicated approval of the Pastoral Letter and three were undecided; yet nine of the U.S. Bishops expressed their rather strong disapproval.

Positive Replies:

Among those who were favorably impressed with the Draft, Bishop Greteman of Sioux City wrote, “I am pleased that the letter will be issued” and Bishop Helmsing of Kansas City-St. Joseph observed that “Draft C reads smoothly and logically. The previous drafts I found difficult to read. This one was a joy to read.”

Bishop Flanagan of Worchester congratulated the Cardinal and the ad hoc committee on “the excellent work you have done in accomplishing a most difficult task.” He indicted that, at one time, he had favored putting Mary’s Divine Motherhood first, but that Father Carroll’s treatment of the dogma in its historical situation proved to be better.

Bishop Treinen of Boise, well-known as a Marian Bishop, wrote “I think it is wonderful!” Evansville’s Bishop Shea found “the thoughts contained to be very important and inspiring,” and Bishop Dempsey, auxiliary in Chicago wrote, “I am very pleased with the draft… It demonstrates fine scholarship and a sincere vision of faith.”

Bishop Gallagher of Lafayette in Indiana found the proposed draft “very well organized. I hope for a generous response by our people when the pastoral is published and approved. We must develop a love and devotion to Mary as an antidote to the paganism and barbarism in our day.”

Bishop Cunningham of Syracuse approved of the draft overall but urged the authors to “place the Mother of God immediately after John’s
Gospel. This is the fundamental privilege of Mary and the *raison d’etre* of all the others”.

Gallup’s Bishop Hastrich wrote “I am pleased with the present arrangement, but say clearly ‘Mary is our Mother, since we are members of the Mystical Body of Christ!’”

Bishop Connolly of Baker urged the writers to “point out some of the problems we have today…The Blessed Mother is a powerful intercessor and model.”

Several of the Bishops’ letters were, of course, very brief: Bishop Cronin of Fall River offered, “My hearty endorsement of the Pastoral Letter as now formulated.” Bishop Tracy of Baton Rouge wrote: “Very good!” On the other hand, Bishop Leven of San Angelo said, “I have read it several times and studied it; I am very pleased with the placement and presentation.” Bishop Brunini of Natchez-Jackson wrote, “It has my deepest approval.”

Burlington’s Bishop Marshall stated, “I am favorably impressed with this Draft C of the document,” and Bishop Daley of Harrisburg also expressed his “favorable reaction.”

Bishop Speltz of St Cloud replied, “I like Draft C and I am happy that this project was undertaken.” He added, “The extensive biblical consideration is excellent.”

Bishop Waters of Raleigh’s brief note said: “I approve every detail.” Archbishop Byrne of Dubuque approved “placing Mother of God at the beginning of the section.” He found Draft C “a much better document than last draft; I think that it is a magnificent document and certainly the best Pastoral on our Blessed Lady that I have ever read.”

Bishop Bell of Sacramento called “the insights into Mary’s Spiritual Motherhood excellent”. Bishop Begin of Oakland said, “I like ‘Draft C’ much better… I also recommend that the pastoral be made available to all Catholics in the country, first of all, by complete publication in our Catholic papers.”
“I reviewed the letter with great edification and joy,” Bishop Fletcher, retired Ordinary of Little Rock wrote. “It covers very thoroughly not only the Blessed Virgin’s relationship to Christ but also her relation to us, her spiritual children.” The Bishop added that the authors’ “reverential and delicate approach appealed both to the intellect and the heart.”

Bishop Brzana of Ogdensburg wrote, “It is an excellent letter, orthodox, authentic, and balanced … It certainly provides fresh and deep scriptural insights of great value…It will promote scriptural and ecumenical studies of Mary.”

Bishop Durick of Nashville found the draft “highly praiseworthy, but I would like to see it shortened … Fundamentally, it is a beautiful testament to our Blessed Lady, our faith in and our love for her. It is very timely.”

Bishop Guilfoyle of Stockton said the Pastoral Letter “will be most helpful in catechizing the faithful … Homilies will add to the explanation.”

The Archbishop of New York, Cardinal Cooke wrote, “The main point that has to be made loud and clear in this pastoral is the propriety and value of devotion to the Blessed Mother. The number of scriptural and doctrinal points in the first chapters might cause the Pastoral Letter to lose its force… ‘Mary in Christian Devotion’ is the heart of the matter. Can it be moved forward even to the beginning?”

Bishop Tschoepe of Dallas called the draft “excellent”, asking the authors to “make it as positive as possible. We do not have to apologize for our love and devotion for the Mother of God!” Bishop Mussio of Steubenville wrote that it was a “beautiful draft” and expressed his “satisfaction that Mary is being given her due in the Church.”

Negative Replies:

Among those who replied in the negative was Archbishop Whealon of Hartford, who found the letter “doctrinally carefully done…(but) I am not happy with the order of treatment. Theotokos is the basic Marian dogma; the others are secondary. The document misses this truth, and the style is irritating.”
The retired Bishop of Sioux City, Joseph Mueller, said the tone of the letter needed to be more urgent.87 “Mary has suffered from the arrogant and rebellious mentality of the ‘sixties’, especially during the late Vatican II period.” Bishop Elwell of Columbus88 warned that “there are many cases of superstition regarding the Blessed Virgin. Our Protestant friends know about these and are bothered by them. The letter needs to address these and other ecumenical concerns.” Bishop Green89 of Reno also mentioned “an ecumenical problem: Why is ‘Mediatrix and Spiritual Mother’ a major section? All in all, the draft is too long, too repetitive.”

Archbishop Sheen90 rejected the document because of its style. “It is an interesting lecture for seminarians, but it is unrelated to the comprehension of our people. The style has to be more vibrant and the pages should have blood run out of them instead of ink. The Blessed Mother deserves the best of our literary and respective effort.” The Bishop of Santa Rosa, M. Hurley,91 also found the draft “too long, ponderous, too involved — must be completely rewritten in a style that is attractive and appealing.”

Bishop O’Keefe of Davenport92 stated, “It would be my hope that the present draft will be subjected to a thorough and rigorous revision, with a broader range of theologians and exegetes.”

Bishop Breitenbeck of Grand Rapids93, who had consulted “a group in the diocese” about “Draft B” (and who reacted negatively to the Letter at that time), gathered another group of priests and sisters who were “pursuing graduate degrees in theology at Aquinas College” to study “Draft C”. The group wrote:

Are the Bishops following a good hierarchy of values? While Mary is important to us, are there not other values even more important which bishops have not yet addressed at such length? Why not a Pastoral Letter on the Eucharist? Why not one on Prayer: Private and Public? Why not one on Life in the Spirit?

The “second Grand Rapids group” also forwarded a “suggested bibliography”, to show that “on this issue both Bishops and theologians are in concert.”94
Perhaps the most interesting objections to “Draft C” came from Archbishop Bernardin, who had left the NCCB General Secretariat to become Ordinary of Cincinnati. His was the last of the *modi* to arrive at Cardinal Carberry’s office. Archbishop Bernardin wrote that he had shared the draft with a scripture scholar and two theologians in Cincinnati archdiocese. He agreed with their assessments that:

1) The pastoral is intended to help those Catholics who have a great devotion to the Blessed Mother and who are dismayed by the apparent lack of Marian devotion since Vatican II. But it is also intended, I am sure, for the more “liberal” Catholics — theologians and faithful alike — whose understanding of Marian theology is somewhat deficient. There is some concern that the language and style may not appeal to this latter group.

2) Too much emphasis is placed at times on Our Lady’s “privileges”… (which are) somewhat alien to biblical and traditional thought.

3) More could be done to make the letter more obviously Christocentric. Following example of *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII, there should be a very explicit statement early in the pastoral that Mary is to be venerated within the mystery of Christ. Mary should be seen throughout the document as coming from and leading to Christ. As it is, our Blessed Mother often is mentioned and only then Christ is brought into the picture.

4) It would be good to develop more fully the primary role of the liturgy in “Mary in Christian Devotion.”

Archbishop Bernardin’s objections would be voiced again during the voting on the Pastoral Letter at the Bishops’ Regional Meetings.

**3.4 “Draft D” — April 1973**

The fourth draft of the Pastoral Letter, called “Draft D”, would benefit greatly from the assistance of a language “stylist”. “Draft D” was in the Bishops’ hands when they finally voted on the Pastoral Letter at their Spring 1973 Regional Meetings.
3.4a A Stylist for the Pastoral Letter

There had been many concerns and some negative comments about the style, structure and language of the Pastoral Letter throughout its drafts. Cardinal Carberry informed the other members of the ad hoc committee that

I have written to the Reverend Bernard Theall, O.S.B. and have sent him a copy of various drafts of our letter. He will serve as the stylist about whom we have been speaking. I have asked that he join our group as a consultant and that he begin his revision for style on “Draft D” at once.96

Father Theall first met with the ad hoc committee in Saint Louis on March 30, 1973. He would work closely with Father Carroll for several months on the Pastoral Letter’s style and composition.

3.4b Review of Draft D

“Draft D” was produced and distributed very quickly; it was mailed to all Bishops on April 13, 1973, just two months after they had received “Draft C”.

In Chapter One, beginning with the Bible, the Pastoral Letter followed a basically historical order. The scriptural evidence moved from the Pauline “God sent his Son, born of a woman” (Gal. 4:4) into Lucan and Johannine materials. The biblical consideration was extensive by design, introducing such themes as Mary’s virginal motherhood and role as model of faith and fulfillment to the Church, both in Saint Luke’s “daughter of Zion” (a long treatment of how “Luke sees in Mary the daughter of Zion who rejoices because God is with her and who praises His greatness for pulling down the mighty and exalting the humble”) and Saint John’s “woman”.

Interestingly, “thanks to recent researches of scholars”, one mention of the time of the Biblical writings during the first century, A.D. was changed:
Under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the early Church had reflected for nearly half a century on Jesus, who He was and why He had come, before any book of the New Testament was written.

By the time of promulgation, the “time frame” mentioned had changed, the statement reading:

Under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the early Church had long reflected on Jesus … before any book of the New Testament was written.

Chapter Two, “The Church’s continuing understanding of Mary” became “The Church’s Understanding of the Mystery of Mary,” illustrated by the sub-headings “New Eve”, “Virginity”, “Blessedness” and, as defined in 431 A.D., “Mother of God” — keeping to the end Father Carroll’s scholarly insistence on treating the topics in historical order. To complete the picture of “holy Mary”, the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption were introduced under “Blessedness”.

In “Draft D” the section “Mediatrix and Spiritual Mother” became an entire chapter — Chapter Three. These ways of describing Mary’s “share in her Son’s saving work” were explored, especially the spiritual maternity (six and a half pages compared to less than three for mediatrix).

Chapter Four, “Mary in Our Life,” explained the intercession of Mary in union with the risen Christ and in the Communion of Saints. The liturgy served as the focal point here, and further manifestations of Marian devotion were considered, such as the Rosary and practices associated with the officially-recognized apparitions of the Virgin Mary.

“Draft D” included the statement that “Catholic belief and devotion to Mary pose special ecumenical problems.” A section took up this topic.

Chapter Five, the final major section, was entitled “Mary, Mother of the Church” and included a brief explanation of this title, and an application of our Lady’s role to many areas of Christian life which were threatened and undergoing major changes in the Church: family life, parents and children, the unborn, the single life, and religious and priestly life.
All in all, “Draft D” included wording that was more precise theologically than “Draft C”; additionally, it was a great improvement in terms of composition and style, thanks to the collaboration of Father Carroll and Father Theall in the very short time leading up to the final draft and the Bishops’ voting.

3.4c The Bishops’ Regional Voting

On March 23, 1973, Cardinal Carberry sent a letter to Father Kelly at the NCCB to inform him of the ad hoc committee members who would be present to assist the Bishops at each of the NCCB Regional Meetings. Because the Pastoral Letter would be discussed regionally — and not at a general meeting of all the Bishops together — Cardinal Carberry arranged for at least one member of the ad hoc committee to present at each regional meeting:

- Region I: Cardinal Medeiros and Monsignor Falls
- Region II: Father Kugelman, CP
- Region III: Bishop Dougherty and Monsignor Falls
- Region IV: Monsignor McDonough
- Region V: Father O’Connell, CSSR
- Region VI: Cardinal Carberry
- Region VII: Father Theall, OSB
- Region VIII: Bishop Maloney
- Region IX: Archbishop Baum
- Region X: Father O’Connell
- Region XI: Cardinal Manning
- Region XII: Father Jelly, OP

Additionally, Father Carroll would attend a meeting of the Administrative Committee of the NCCB in Washington, DC to answer the questions of the Bishops gathered there.
The regional meetings were held in late April in each of the twelve regions across the country.

The voting results, by region, indicated that in nine of the twelve regions, the vote was unanimously in favor of the Pastoral Letter. One region voted 24 to 1 in favor and another region voted 18 to 3 in favor.

In only one region was the vote “against” the Pastoral Letter, 13 opposed, 1 abstention. Furthermore, in all the country, only 16 U.S. Bishops voted “against” the Pastoral Letter.

According to the reports sent to Cardinal Carberry and the NCCB, the voting proceeded as follows:

Region I — Unanimously in favor.

In Holyoke, Massachusetts, the Bishops voted unanimously in favor of the Pastoral Letter on Mary. Cardinal Medeiros reported that “one suggestion that received consensus… was the preparation of a popular form of the Pastoral Letter on Our Lady for easier reading.”

Region II — Unanimously in favor.

In Syracuse, New York, Cardinal Cooke invited Father Kugelman to stay until the ballots were counted. Twenty-five Bishops were present. The Pastoral was approved unanimously, twenty-five in favor.

Region III — Unanimously in favor.

In Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the Bishops unanimously approved the issuance of the Pastoral on Our Lady. It was noted that “there is only one reference to Our Lady of Guadalupe here, but no mention of her in the historical section.”

Region IV — Unanimously in favor.

At Charleston, South Carolina, the Bishops voted 18–0 in favor of the Pastoral Letter. The consensus seemed to be that another title
may be preferable.\textsuperscript{101} Even though the Bishops endorsed the Pastoral enthusiastically, “they still thought it needed more style.”\textsuperscript{102}

Region V — Unanimously in favor.

At New Orleans, Louisiana, there were no particular comments recorded or forwarded. Archbishop Hannan chaired the meeting, and the Bishops voted unanimously in favor.\textsuperscript{103}

Region VI — 13 opposed; 1 abstention.

In Farmington, Michigan, the Bishops of Region VI voted against “Draft D” for the following reasons: a) The length and the style of the letter do not seem to be truly pastoral. b) The Pastoral should be so written as to help both those who already have devotion to the Blessed Virgin and those who have abandoned or who never had such devotion. c) The Pastoral does not seem to have been written in the spirit of \textit{Lumen Gentium} and, in fact, seems to be something of a regression from that spirit. d) On the basis of consultation with competent scholars, there are shortcomings in the Pastoral from the point of view of theology and Sacred Scripture.\textsuperscript{104}

Region VII — 24 in favor, 1 abstention.

In Chicago, Illinois, the vote of the 25 Bishops was 24 “yes”, 0 “no” and 1 abstention. No further report was sent.

Region VIII — Unanimously in favor.

At Denver, Colorado, it was moved by Archbishop Byrne and seconded by Bishop Hacker to approve the Pastoral Letter. The motion passed unanimously.\textsuperscript{105} The Bishops passed a resolution “\textit{that the option be given to Bishops to distribute the proposed letter to the clergy of their dioceses in the name of the Pastoral Letter Committee, and under the signature of the Cardinal-Chairman.}”\textsuperscript{106}
Region IX — Unanimously in favor.

In Saint Louis, Missouri, the Bishops voted 20 in favor, none against, none abstained. Four Bishops had to leave before the Executive Session.107

Region X — 18 in favor; 3 opposed.

In Mesilla Park, New Mexico, the Bishops of Region X unanimously adopted two motions: a) that the Pastoral be made shorter than at present and b) that it be put into better English.108 “There was considerable feeling that insufficient attention was paid to the history and practice of devotion to our Lady among Mexican-Americans.”109

Region XI — Unanimously in favor.

In San Francisco, California, a unanimous vote was cast for the acceptance of the Pastoral “as it stands”, according to Cardinal Manning. “The Bishops are very happy about the prospects of it.”110

Region XII — unanimously in favor.

In Seattle, Washington, the Bishops of Region XII included the following motion in their approval of “Draft D”: that the final draft of the Marian Pastoral Letter be approved, with the encouragement that the observance of the two Marian holydays (Assumption and Immaculate Conception) be moved to the nearest Sunday.111

The specific suggestion of Region I (for a shorter version of the Pastoral Letter) was not further considered, most likely because the brief timetable for publishing the Letter in its full form — in both English and Spanish112 — left no opportunity for consideration of an edited version; the specific suggestion of Region XII concerning the Marian holydays would be reconsidered and suggested many times by the Bishops of that region for several years thereafter.
3.4d Introduction and Title

“Draft D” had included the “Introduction” to the Pastoral Letter — the work of Cardinal Manning, with assistance from Bishop Dougherty; Father Carroll has recalled that

I did not write the short introduction; that was the work of the Cardinal … and some of his advisors. It’s a different style. It incorporated it, of course, but that was uniquely the Bishops’ contribution. Not that they didn’t have a great deal to say about the rest of the content; but that part was theirs.\(^{113}\)

Some Bishops referred to the Introduction as a “Pulpit Letter”, but no directions were ever sent from the NCCB or the *ad hoc* committee to priests/pastors to “read” the Introduction from the pulpit.

The Introduction/Pulpit Letter stated — in the first person plural — the Bishops’ intentions:

- “We your Bishops and brothers in faith are addressing to you a Pastoral Letter on the Blessed Virgin Mary.
- “Let it be clearly understood that the Second Vatican Council in no way downgraded our faith in or devotion towards Mary.”
- ”We repeat the Church’s familiar words in praise of the Mother of Jesus:

  Blessed be the great Mother of God, Mary most holy.
  Blessed be her holy and Immaculate Conception.
  Blessed be her glorious Assumption.
  Blessed be the name of Mary, Virgin and Mother.”

Cardinal Carberry had also asked the individual Bishops of each Region to vote their preference for the language of the Pastoral Letter’s title: either *Behold Thy Mother* or *Behold Your Mother*. Among the Bishops who voted, 129 preferred “Your”; 60 preferred “Thy”. After Father Carroll’s presentation to the NCCB Administrative Committee, one Bishop asked Cardinal Carberry if “Woman of Faith” could be added. Thus the full title, *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*, was born.\(^{114}\)
CHAPTER CONCLUSIONS

The U.S. Bishops appeared to be evenly divided “pro” and “con” on the earliest draft of their proposed Pastoral Letter on Mary; certain officials at the NCCB suggested that the letter be delayed or cancelled.

As time went on, however, the Bishops moved to general support for the Pastoral Letter, offering many individual *modi*.

Finally, the Bishops voted overwhelmingly in favor of *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*, but with a vocal minority against.

In all of this — including the misrepresentation in the press — the writing and consensus-building mirrored in many ways the story of *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII at the Council. Yet, almost immediately after its promulgation, the “voice of teaching” in the U.S. Bishops’ Pastoral Letter would be somewhat “muted” by another Marian document — this one coming from the Vatican: *Marialis Cultus*.

The next chapter provides a synthesis of the teaching in *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* — and an analytical look at the Pastoral Letter in light of both *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII and Pope Paul VI’s directives in *Marialis Cultus*.
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Chapter 4 – Behold Your Mother
Woman of Faith: Synthesis and Analyses

In this three-part chapter, first a synthesis of the teaching in Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith is undertaken. Additionally, two analyses are made. In part two, an analytical comparison of the U.S. Bishops’ Pastoral Letter on Mary to Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII is made, based on Rene Laurentin’s “seven movements of aggiornamento” as points of reference; at the time of the Council, these movements were of highest interest in the life of the Church. In part three, a final analysis examines the Pastoral Letter in light of the principles and guidelines in Marialis Cultus.

4.1 A Synthesis of the U.S. Bishops’ Pastoral Letter

“We urge the restoration and renewal of
the ancient love of Christendom for the Mother of the Lord
as a tribute to lay tenderly at her feet”

US. Bishop¹

Issued by the Bishops of the United States, the Pastoral Letter Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith attempted to address the “crisis” in Marian devotion and break the “silence” about Mary in the decade following Vatican II. As such, it was a very ambitious document.

The Pastoral Letter had been discussed first in November 1970 by the small group of Bishops and priests who served on the Board of the National Shrine of Immaculate Conception in Washington, D.C. Later, the Administrative Committee of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops accepted the task of producing a Pastoral Letter on Mary, urging that it follow the theology of Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII. For nearly three years, an ad hoc committee of Bishops and theologians, diligently chaired by John Cardinal Carberry of Saint Louis, worked on the Pastoral Letter through its various drafts, while considering the numerous modi of individual Bishops. The Pastoral Letter, approved by regional votes of the U.S. Bishops, was promulgated by the NCCB as Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith on November 21, 1973.
As presented in its best-selling booklet form by the U.S. Bishops’ conference, the Pastoral Letter’s teaching was divided into two principal parts:

a “Pulpit Letter” or “Introduction” (articles 1 through 11), from the Bishops themselves, written in the first person plural and addressed to “Dearly beloved brothers and sisters”

and

the main body of the Pastoral Letter, Chapters One through Five (articles 12 through 146), written for the most part in scholarly style by the “theologians who aid(ed) the Bishops in restating the teachings of the Church about Mary” (no. 4).

In the Introduction, the U.S. Bishops hoped to “reaffirm our heritage of faith in Mary, the Mother of God, and to encourage authentic devotion to her” (no. 2). “We should clearly understand that the Second Vatican Council in no way downgraded faith in or devotion to Mary” (no. 3).

The Bishops desired “with all (their) hearts” that the letter would be “received into homes and rectories and seminaries, into schools and institutions of higher learning, into adult education groups, confraternity centers, campus ministries and religious communities” (no. 4). The U.S. Bishops, “united with our Holy Father, proclaim(ed) once more the preeminent position of Mary ‘in the mystery of Christ and the Church’” (no. 11).

In the main part of Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith, the first three chapters were written in scholarly, theological style.

Chapter One: Our Lady in the Bible (articles 12–37) dealt with Old Testament images of Mary found in the history of Israel, especially the feminine images of the “bride of Yahweh” and the “Daughter of Zion”. The books of the Old Testament, “as they are understood by the Church in light of Christian revelation” (no. 19), also afforded reflections on Mary as the Ark of the Covenant and on the “remarkable likenesses between (Mary and) Abraham” (no. 30–33).
Additionally, the first chapter included treatment of the New Testament allusions to Mary in the Gospel of Saint Luke with special emphasis on the Annunciation and Visitation narratives — “the bridge role of Mary between Old Testament and New” (no. 20) — and in narratives from the Gospel of Saint John, particularly Cana and Calvary (no. 34–37).

Chapter Two: The Church’s Understanding of the Mystery of Mary (articles 38–64) considered the development of the understanding of Mary throughout Christian history. After the Scriptures were explored in Chapter One, Chapter Two gave consideration to the teachings of the Fathers of the Church, particularly their depiction of Mary as “the New Eve” (no. 40–41). The chapter also treated the doctrines of the Virginal Conception (no. 42–48) and Perpetual Virginity (no. 49–50).

In addition, the second chapter treated “the blessedness of Mary”, specifically Mary’s “initial holiness”- the Immaculate Conception shown in relation to Christ and the Church — and her Assumption — expressed as the Lord’s ultimate gift to holy Mary and as an eschatological hope for the entire People of God.

Mary as the Mother of God was the final consideration in Chapter Two’s treatment of the Church’s understanding of Mary, exploring the Church’s insistence on the title of Theotokos for nearly seventeen centuries because “no other formula makes evident the intimate link between devotion to Mary and belief in the Incarnation” (no. 62).

Chapter Three: Mary, Mediatrix and Spiritual Mother (articles 65–80) was a relatively brief chapter which devoted five articles to the term “mediatrix”, even though the Second Vatican Council had used the title only once. The Pastoral Letter stated that “as mediatrix, Mary takes nothing away from Christ’s all-sufficient mediatorship” (no. 66), and that “Mary’s mediatorial role, correctly understood, is in perfect accord with the centrality of Christ” (no. 68). What Mary began on earth in association with the saving mission of Jesus, the Pastoral Letter stated, she continues still, in union with the risen Christ (no. 69).

The third chapter also treated Mary’s Spiritual Motherhood. She was presented both as Mother of the Members of Christ and as the first of all those Christian faithful who are “mothers of Christ because they do the will of his Father”(no. 75).⁴
Furthermore, Mary was shown to be the “perfect disciple”, the great Mother figure of the Church to whom the Church looks in its apostolic work. “So too, through the Church, Jesus continues to be born and grow in the hearts of the faithful” (no. 80).

In Chapter Four: Mary in Our Life (articles 81–112), the Pastoral Letter rather abruptly turned back to the first person plural style of the Introduction/ “Pulpit Letter”. Perhaps because this section dealt with the “heart of the matter” — “Mary in Christian Devotion” (no. 91–100)- the Bishops interrupted the scholarly writing of the theologian-members of the ad hoc committee to intersperse their own concerns and suggestions.

After reviewing Mary’s intercessory role and place in the Communion of Saints (LG, no. 7) calling the seventh chapter of Lumen Gentium “even more neglected than the chapter on our Blessed Lady” (no. 86) Chapter Four of the Pastoral Letter invoked the Bishops’ reasons for writing the letter:

We have passed abruptly to near silence… The Church is suffering a malaise with respect to the commemoration of Mary (no. 91).

In writing this Pastoral Letter, our concern about our Lady is most keenly felt in the area of devotion (no. 92).

We view with great sympathy the distress our people feel over the loss of devotion to our Lady and we share their concern that the young be taught a deep and true love for the Mother of God… Not only in the liturgy, but also in the beloved devotions … the rosary and the scapular… (no. 93).

The Bishops did not fail to offer some suggestions “to increase love and devotion to Blessed Virgin”:

We offer some suggestions … above all, the renewed liturgy (which) offers immense riches with respect to the Mother of the Lord… Having the liturgy in English … the present lectionary contains more readings than we ever had before, from Old Testament and New… In the current calendar, there are more optional days on which a Marian votive Mass may be celebrated, on Saturdays in particular … (The) missal of 1970 has many
excellent new prayers for Mary’s feasts, based on the Bible and in the spirit of the Council … There are four prefaces of our Lady… (no. 94).

Besides her place in the liturgy, our Lady has been honored by an amazingly rich variety of extra-liturgical devotional forms … in particular the rosary … It is unwise to reject the rosary without a trial simply because of the accusation that it comes from the past, that it is repetitious and ill-suited to sophisticated moderns. The Scriptural riches of the rosary are of permanent value … (no. 96).

Nevertheless, the Bishops suggested updating “devotions with long histories”:

We can freely experiment. New sets of mysteries (of the rosary) are possible. We have customarily gone from the childhood of Jesus to His Passion, bypassing the whole public life. There is rich matter here for rosary meditation, such as the wedding feast of Cana… Also, rosary vigils with an instructive use of readings … and with recitation of a decade or two, if not all five… Hymns can be introduced as well, and time allowed for periods of silent prayer” (no. 97).

Additionally, the Bishops called for new elements of Marian devotion:

“In these changing times great inventiveness on the part of the whole Catholic people is needed. Under the guidance of the Holy Father and the Bishops we must revitalize old forms and devise new devotions corresponding to current needs and desires… The liturgical season should set the tone for Marian prayers at each particular time of the year, e.g. May devotions should reflect paschal and Pentecostal orientations. Advent provides a unique opportunity for the consideration of Mary…” (no. 98).

The Bishops then reflected on apparitions of our Lady and their effects on popular devotion: “We turn our reflection now to … Lourdes … Saint Catherine Laboure … La Salette … Guadalupe … Fatima” (no. 99). Recognizing the “basic Christian themes” and the Church-approved pilgrimages and other devotions associated with certain private revelations, the Bishops reminded Catholics that they are “encouraged
to practice such devotions when they are in conformity with authentic devotion to Mary … yet the Church does not make mandatory the acceptance of either the original story (of the apparition) or of particular forms of piety springing from it” (no. 100). The U.S. Bishops echoed the Council: “We remind true lovers of our Lady of the danger of superficial sentiment and vain credulity.” The Pastoral Letter stated: “Our faith does not seek new gospels” (no. 100).

Immediately following the treatment of Marian devotion, articles 101 to 112 in the same chapter dealt with the Blessed Virgin and ecumenism. The Bishops continued the “first person plural” style: “We live in a new era of friendly relations between Catholics and members of other Christian Churches, Orthodox, Anglican and Protestant” (no. 101). “For too long Mary’s place in Catholic doctrine and, even more, in Catholic devotion has been a sharp point of difference with other Christians in the West” (no. 103). “We are convinced that all Christians share a basic reverence for the Mother of Jesus…” (no. 106).

Most pointedly, the Bishops made a request: “We ask our brothers in other Christian Churches to reexamine with us Mary’s place in our common patrimony” (no. 107), for “no sound ecumenism can ignore the question of Mary” (no. 109).

The U.S. Bishops did not, however, see the ecumenical road ahead as an easy one. They noted that a “difficulty among Christians is the relationship between Scripture, Tradition, and the Church’s teaching role … and, most difficult of all, is the problem: what can man do under the power of grace?” (no. 110).

In Chapter Five: *Mary, Mother of the Church* (articles 113–145), the Pastoral Letter returned to its scholarly style. In this Marian title — given somewhat controversially to the Virgin by Pope Paul VI near the end of the Second Vatican Council (see Chapter 1.3 of this paper) — “the Church of which Mary is Mother was seen as comprising both shepherds and flocks, both pastors and people” (no. 114).

Just as Mary brought forth Jesus by the power of the Holy Spirit, so too is Jesus brought forth and lives in His people through the Spirit (no. 118). The chapter treated *Mary and the Priesthood* (“In Mary, Mother of the Church, the priest has the model of his own devotion to her Son” no.
122); *Mary and Religious Life* (“Now, as throughout the history of the Church, religious find special inspiration in the Virgin Mother of Jesus” no. 128); and *Mary and Family Life* (“Mother of the Holy Family at Nazareth, Mary is mother and queen of every Christian family” no. 131.)

The section also emphasized that “the Blessed Mother protects human life today from the moment of conception through birth … Abortion, the deliberate killing of an unborn fetus, is a heinous crime and a serious sin” (no. 136) and in the same section it was noted that “the dignity which Christ’s redemption won for all women was fulfilled uniquely in Mary as a model of all real feminine freedom … (This) needs to be elaborated into a sound theology on the role of Christian women in contemporary Church and society” (no. 142).

Regarding *Mary and Youth* (no. 143–144) the Bishops pointed out that “young people… will find in Mary the totally unselfish person, the brave young woman who could face and accept the hidden future” (no. 143), for “many young people today are eager to make the world into a better place where justice and peace and love will prevail” (no. 144). Addressing *Mary and Single Life*, the Pastoral Letter stated, “Mary is a model also for women who live a single life in the world. This can be a true vocation from God, freely chosen under the inspiration of grace, bringing with it the fruits of joy, personal holiness and unselfish service of others” (no. 145).

An “Appendix” on “Mary’s Place in American Catholic History” followed, a three-page review of devotion to the Mother of God starting with Christopher Columbus’ flagship, the *Santa Maria*. Also mentioned were the influence of the Spanish missionaries in the South, in the West and in Florida; the French missionaries from the North (who explored the Mississippi and called it the “River of the Immaculate Conception”); and the English who established Maryland, where religious freedom would be guaranteed.7

The “Appendix” further noted the nation’s special patronage under Mary, the Immaculate Conception; the many cathedrals, churches, chapels and institutions named for Mary; and “every sort of Catholic enterprise, e.g., Sodalities, Legion of Mary, and the Family Rosary, which has spread from America to all the world”, and ended with a brief history of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception.8
The booklet in which the Pastoral Letter was promulgated also contained a page which listed twelve “Suggested Readings” (including works by Donal Flanagan, Raymond Brown, Henri de Lubac, Karl Rahner, Joseph Ratzinger, Edward Schillebeeckx, and Max Thurian); “coming up with the list was a collaborative effort,” Father Eamon Carroll recalled.9 Fifty-four study questions on Chapters One through Five — prepared by Redemptorist Father Hugh O’Connell — followed.

CONCLUSION OF 4.1

In one final paragraph (n. 146) — again resorting to the first person and their rather urgent style — the Bishops expansively declared that “we are deeply convinced that the correct appreciation of the mystery of Mary leads to a deep and perfect understanding of Christ and His Church. “

In determining whether the Pastoral Letter added significantly to that appreciation of Mary and to the understanding of the Church, the question now becomes, “How faithful was Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith to the Constitution on the Church, namely, to Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII?”

4.2 Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith and Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII

First of all, we should clearly understand that the Second Vatican Council in no way downgraded Faith in or devotion to Mary.10

Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith was promulgated by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops on November 21, 1974 — exactly nine years after the promulgation of Lumen Gentium during the third session of Vatican II. In this section, after an examination of the topical structures of the two documents, a comparative analysis is made based on Laurentin’s seven theological “movements” which influenced the Conciliar period:

the return to the sources, in the biblical and patristic movements; in the doctrinal sphere, movements such as those centering on ecclesiology or on the history of salvation; in
The pastoral order the *liturgical* and *missionary* movements; finally, the *ecumenical* movement.\(^{11}\)

These “movements” are used because they were identified as the contemporary trends which Laurentin noted

all proceeded from an irresistible yearning for experiences the Church had not had in depth for some centuries… In every domain there was a renewal of perspective… the field of Marian doctrine included. The proper task of the Second Vatican Council was to sum up this positive contribution, a large and lively one, in Chapter VIII of *Lumen Gentium*.\(^{12}\)

The movements were part of the history of the Church leading up to the Council — and were active considerations in every topic at the Council, including *LG* VIII. It is legitimate, then, to examine *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* using the seven “movements” from Laurentin as “criteria” for comparative analysis.

A structural analysis of *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* in light of *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII reveals their similarities. Chapter VIII of *Lumen Gentium* (entitled “The Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in the Mystery of Christ and the Church”) was only seventeen articles in length and was “intend(ed) to describe with diligence both the role of the Blessed Virgin Mary … and the duties of mankind toward (her).”\(^{13}\) *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* contained one hundred fifty six articles; in it, the U.S. Bishops wanted to share with the Catholic people their faith in the truths concerning Mary and to express their filial love for her (no. 3). The authors of the U.S. Bishops’ Pastoral Letter were obliged to follow *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII; hence, both documents shared a stated two-fold objective:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Lumen Gentium</em> Chapter Eight described:</th>
<th><em>Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith</em> shared:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) the role of Mary and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) the duties of mankind toward her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) the truths concerning Mary and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) the expressions of filial love for her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These objectives, considered equivalently as 1) doctrine (“the role of Mary” and “the truths concerning Mary”) and 2) devotion (“the duties of mankind toward her” and “the expressions of filial love for her”) demonstrated that the world’s Bishops at the Council and the Bishops of the U.S. in their Pastoral Letter shared a common apostolic mission to both teach the Faith and encourage men and women in devotion to Mary.

In both doctrine and devotion, *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII can be said to have anticipated — in an implicit way — documents such as the U.S. Bishop’s Pastoral Letter, for although Vatican II was, as Pope Paul pointed out, “the first time an ecumenical council had present(ed) such a vast synthesis of the place of Mary in the mystery of Christ and the Church,”14 *Lumen Gentium* itself stated that the Council Fathers did “not have it in mind to give a complete doctrine on Mary.”15 Father Carroll remarked that “the Council documents are skeletal and need to be fleshed out. That’s what we theologians” — the various ad hoc committee members with their different areas of expertise — “attempted to do throughout this letter.”16

From the reverse perspective, *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* — nearly ten times longer than the Conciliar chapter on Mary — explicitly evoked *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII. The U.S. Bishops’ wrote in their Introduction:

> The eighth Chapter of the Constitution on the Church is a clear and penetrating account of Catholic teaching on the Blessed Mother of God. *Other ages have erected shrines and temples in her honor. This chapter … is in reality a beautiful spiritual shrine* in which the Mother of Jesus is honored and from which she continues to speak to us with a mother’s loving concern (no. 3).

As recounted in previous chapters, the NCCB’s Administrative Committee was adamant that the Pastoral Letter on Mary follow *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII — and the ad hoc committed themselves to charting such a course while writing *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*

A comparison of the topical outlines of the two documents further demonstrates general similarities between *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII and *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*. Both documents contain
an Introduction, are composed of five parts, and moved topically from scripture and salvation history to doctrine and then to devotional and ecumenical consideration:

### Lumen Gentium Chapter Eight

1. *Introduction: reverence for the Blessed Virgin*  
   *Biblical/ Salvation History*

2. *The role of the Blessed Mother in the economy of salvation*  
   *Biblical/ Salvation History*

3. *The Blessed Virgin and the Church*  
   *Doctrinal*

4. *Devotion to the Blessed Virgin*  
   *Devotional*

5. *Mary as a sign of hope*  
   *Ecumenical*

### Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith

**Introduction**

1. *Our Lady in the Bible*  
   *Biblical/ Salvation History*

2. *The Church’s Understanding of Mary*  
   *Doctrinal*

3. *Mary, Mediatrix and Spiritual Mother*  
   *Devotional*

4. *Mary in Our Life*  
   *Devotional / Ecumenical*

5. *Mary, Mother of the Church*

Yet even a cursory examination of the expanded topical outlines of the two documents shows that *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* is — as it was intended — a much more detailed exposition of Catholic thought on Mary:
Outline of Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII

The Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in the Mystery of Christ and the Church

I. Introduction: Reverence for the Blessed Virgin

2. Her role in the economy of salvation
   Testimony of Scripture
   Her role in the Incarnation
   Her union with Jesus in the work of salvation
     During Jesus’ infancy and childhood
     During Jesus’ public life
   Pentecost and the Assumption

3. The Blessed Virgin and Church
   The unique mediation of Christ
   Mary our Mother in the Order of grace
   Mary’s maternal intercession
   Mary in the mystery of the Church
   The Church as virgin and mother
   Mary as a model of virtues

4. Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary
   Veneration of Mary
   Balanced devotion

5. Mary as a Sign of Hope
   Mary gives hope to and consoles the People of God on earth
   Mary intercedes for the Church.

Outline of

Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith

Introduction

1. Our Lady in the Bible
   Women of the Old Testament
     “Bride of Yahweh”, “Daughter of Zion”
     Eve and Mary
     Nathan/David; “Son of God”; Ark of the
     Covenant ; Abraham; Elizabeth;
   Mary in John’s Gospel: Cana and Calvary

2. The Church’s Understanding of Mary
   Seeing Mary in the Scriptures; The New Eve
     Virginal Conception:
     Church’s Constant Teaching; Creeds;
     Fathers; Isaac, Samuel and the Baptist ;
     Perpetual Virginity: St. Jerome
     “Brothers of the Lord”
     Mary’s Blessedness: Immaculate
     Conception; Assumption; Theotokos

3. Mary Mediatrix and Spiritual Mother
   Vatican II and the title “Mediatrix”
   Mary’s role as Mediatrix
   Mary as Spiritual Mother: Mother of the Church;
   Mother of the Members of Christ; Mother of
   the Spiritual Life

4. Mary in Our Life
   Mary as Intercessor/ in Communion of Saints
   Mary in the Mass
   Mary and Those Who Have Died in Christ
   Mary and the Eastern Rites
   Mary in Christian Devotion
   Decline of devotion today
   Mary in the liturgy;
   Extra-liturgical devotions; the Rosary
   Apparitions of Mary
     (Lourdes, LaSalette, Fatima, Guadalupe)
   Mary and Ecumenism:
     Reformation; Hierarchy of Truths
     Tradition and the Magisterium

5. Mary Mother of the Church
   Pope Paul’s use of the title
   Mary and … the Holy Spirit … the
   Priesthood…the Religious Life …Family Life
   … Human Life … Marriage … the home …
   Mary and the Dignity of Women
   Mary and Youth
   Mary and the Single Life in the World
At the Council, after three years of debate about and revisions of *Lumen Gentium*, Chapter VIII proved to be longer than even the original separate schema on Mary. Even more so, *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*, because its authors intended to “flesh out” the footnotes of *Lumen Gentium*, also grew greatly from draft to draft.\(^{17}\)

Comparatively:

Scripture is treated at greater length in *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*;

Mary’s blessedness (e.g. the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption) is explained in more detail in the Pastoral Letter;

Despite the Council’s restricted use of “mediatrix”, the U.S. Bishops included five articles specifically on “Mary as Mediatrix”;

Mary as “model of virtues” is widely expanded in the Bishops’ Pastoral Letter;

And most evidently, devotion to (or the cult of) Mary — two articles long in *LG* VIII — swells to ten pages and twenty-two articles on the devotional life (including ecumenical considerations) in *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*.

Again, the following comparative analysis of the content of the two documents uses as a matrix Laurentin’s historical and theological insight into the seven “movements” which, prior to the Council, had become “first-rank centers of interest in the life of the Church.”\(^{18}\)

The first consideration is “Biblical.”

### 4.2a “The Biblical Movement”

The Biblical movement, Laurentin has noted, was not at all directed against Our Lady. The new perspectives in Biblical studies allowed a new style in Marian studies — a return to the sources — in which Mary could be considered in a renewed light. An underdeveloped Biblical
study of the Blessed Virgin could be further developed, Laurentin contended, completing what before the Council had been incomplete.\textsuperscript{19}

*Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII represented a conscious effort at Biblical theology.\textsuperscript{20} The Council Fathers, immediately after a brief “Introduction”, employed the “testimony of scripture” — both the Old and New Testaments. These five articles\textsuperscript{21} studied *The Role of the Blessed Mother in the Economy of Salvation* and included seventeen references to Sacred Scripture.

*Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*, like the Conciliar chapter on Mary, followed its “Introduction” by also going directly into a consideration of “Our Lady in the Bible”. In the twenty-six articles of Chapter 1 (no. 12–37), it included over thirty references to scriptural texts.

Both documents began their Biblical consideration with Galatians 4:4–5, the oldest scriptural witness to the Mother of the Savior\textsuperscript{22}: “When the fullness of time came, God sent his Son, born of a woman … that we might receive the adoption of sons.”

In *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII, the Council Fathers went on to state that the “books of the Old Testament … bring the figure of the woman, the Mother of the Redeemer, into a gradually clearer light”, often an ecclesiotypical light, citing Genesis 3:15, Isaiah 7:14, and Micah 5:2–3. In *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*, the U.S. Bishops cited not only Genesis, Isaiah and Micah, but also specifically mentioned “Eve, Sarah, Miriam, and even the whole people of Israel under a feminine image ‘the bride of Yahweh’, ‘Daughter of Zion’” (n. 13).\textsuperscript{23}

This image of the “Daughter of Zion” was mentioned only once in the Conciliar chapter\textsuperscript{24}, while in the Pastoral Letter it was referred to at least seven times — in article 15 (“Mary is the exalted ‘Daughter of Zion’”); article 16 (“‘Daughter of Zion’ includes ‘the poor and the lowly, the humble of spirit’”); article 17 (“Mary the ‘Daughter of Zion’ who rejoices…”); article 18 (Mary as the Daughter of Zion acted “on behalf of the total remnant”); article 20 (“Mary is at once the individual ‘Daughter of Zion’ and the type of the Church”); article 21 (“…as in the image of the ‘Daughter of Zion’, the liturgy… has in fact incorporated such texts long before their scientific exposition”); and article 22
(“The opening words of Gabriel repeat the promise of hope that the prophet Zephaniah addressed to his people… ‘Shout for joy, 0 daughter Zion’”).

Additionally, *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* — in articles 25, 26 and 27 — included explanations of Marian imagery in the overshadowing cloud (Exodus 40) and in King David and the Ark of the Covenant (2 Samuel 6), as well as a lengthy consideration of the remarkable likenesses between Abraham and Mary in articles 29 through 33. These texts were not given such consideration in *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII.

- Thus, Old Testament references of Mary were used more widely in *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* than in *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII, as the authors of the Pastoral Letter seemed to build on the outline the Council provided.


In *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*, the Lucan treatment of Mary was referred to in articles 12 and 14, and — in a more pronounced way — in an entire section called “The Gospel of Luke” (n. 17–33). This Lucan section treated the “poor and holy people: Elizabeth and Zachary, Anna and Simeon, Joseph and Mary” (n. 17); the bridge-role of Mary between Old Testament and New (no. 20); and an almost line-by-line exegesis of Gabriel’s announcement (nos. 22–33). “Thanks to the recent research of scholars” these scripture passages provided “new depths in the Gospel portrait of Mary” (no. 20).

Additionally, in the U.S. Bishops’ Pastoral Letter, “The Gospel of John” was treated separately in a section of four articles (nos. 34–37), centered again on “the meaning of Mary at Cana” and “the woman near the cross of Jesus.”

Finally, and very importantly for lay Catholics and for their Protestant brothers and sisters, *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* included the statement that “the Bible is read rightly in the Church, whose interpretation is guided by the Holy Spirit” (no. 43).
• In sum, the role of the Blessed Mother in the New Testament in *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII included Luke’s Gospel and John’s Gospel accounts and images of the Virgin. *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* greatly expanded these New Testament considerations of Mary, because the Bishop’s letter sought to include a much wider presentation of Mary in the Bible — perhaps for reasons ecumenical as well as biblical.

4.2b “The Patristic Movement”

In addition to the Biblical movement, another aspect of *resourcement* (a “return to the sources”) in the Conciliar life of the Church was the Patristic movement.

“There were fears among some Mariologists,” Laurentin noted, that “the Fathers of the Church were hesitant regarding Mary’s holiness and her virginity, knew little of her Assumption, and assumed that guilt for sin was universal except for Christ Himself.” Yet in actuality the patristic movement supported and enhanced Marian studies. Laurentin observed that patristics shed light on the importance and meaning of the Annunciation; made special note of Mary’s faith, emphasizing that she conceived in her heart before she conceived in her body; and renewed the image of Mary as “the new Eve” — an important concept for theological anthropology.

*Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*’s use of patristics echoed the teaching in *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII in three considerations: i. Mary’s Motherhood of the Church; ii. Her Freedom from Sin; and iii. Her Role as Type and Exemplar of the Church.

i. Mary as Mother of the Church. In *Lumen Gentium*’s chapter on Mary, the Council first quoted the ancient Fathers by referring to Saint Augustine’s teaching that she is “the mother of the members of Christ… having cooperated by charity that faithful might be born in the Church, who are members of that Head.” This was included near the beginning (in the second article of the chapter); but in *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* it was not included until more than half way through the entire letter (no. 72).
This was clearly because *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII called Mary the “Mother of Church” in its very title and thus treated it early; the title “Mother of the Church” appeared much later in *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*, in an entire section explaining this title of Mary (no. 113–118).

ii. Mary’s sinlessness. In *Lumen Gentium*, “Mary free from sin” was shown to be a part of Mary’s role in which “the holy Fathers see her as used by God not merely in a passive way, but as freely cooperating in the work of human salvation through obedience and faith.”

*Lumen Gentium* went on to include in the same article the patristic image of Mary as the “New Eve” — beginning with Saint Irenaeus, continuing with Saint Epiphanius, and ending with “death through Eve, life through Mary”; additionally, Saint Jerome, Saint Augustine, Saint Cyril of Jerusalem, Saint John Chrysostum and Saint John Damascene were all mentioned in footnotes regarding this topic.

In *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*, the approach was reversed. The image of the “New Eve” was treated first (no. 40 and 41) by referring to both Saint Justin and Saint Irenaeus, quoting the latter’s parallelism (disobedience of Eve/obedience of Mary … bondage to death/rescue by Virgin); only then did the Pastoral Letter go on to say that “by Saint Jerome’s time, it was common to hear ‘death through Eve, life through Mary’”. Also, the patristic treatment of Mary’s sinlessness came later in the Pastoral Letter — in a six-article section (n. 51–56) completely centered on the blessedness of Mary: “The Virgin Mary was called by the Fathers of the Church ‘all holy’…” (n. 52).

In sum, *Lumen Gentium* started its consideration of the “new Eve” with Saint Jerome; in *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*, the authors followed the historical path, working their way finally to Saint Jerome’s understanding.

iii. Mary as Type and Exemplar of the Church. In the later paragraphs of *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII, Mary was shown — as Saint Ambrose taught — to be a type of the Church in the orders of faith, charity and perfect union with Christ; she stands out in eminent and singular fashion as exemplar for the Church as both virgin and mother. The Council cited Saint Ambrose, Saint Augustine and
others, to teach that “the Church, imitating the Mother of her Lord, and by the power of the Holy Spirit, keeps with virginal purity an entire faith, a firm hope and a sincere charity.”

Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith quoted the Fathers in this regard quite early — in the very beginning of Chapter Two (no.38), also citing Saint Ambrose on Mary as “the model of the Church in the matter of faith, charity and perfect union with Christ”; as “the Church’s model and excellent exemplar in faith and charity”; and as “uniquely virgin and mother within the Church, itself rightly called virgin and mother”. Once again, the Council quoted the Fathers as the heart of its consideration of Mary and the Church, while the U.S. Bishops — through their theologians — used the imagery of the Fathers also, but as an introduction to their treatment of the Church’s understanding of the mystery of Mary.

Thus, even though Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith included the same patristic teaching as did Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII, its order was inverted. The difference in the use of patristics was its placement in the documents. Lumen Gentium quoted the Fathers throughout almost the entirety of Chapter VIII, applying their teaching to many of the various considerations of Mary. Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith slightly expanded the Council’s use of the Fathers, but concentrated that patristic teaching in the early parts of the Pastoral Letter, immediately following its treatment of “Mary in the Bible”, so that the theology of the Letter might keep to the historical order of its development.

An ultimate example of this difference in placement can be noted in the two documents’ use of the term “Mother of God”. At the beginning in fact, in the very title of Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII, the Blessed Virgin Mary was called “Mother of God”, the Conciliar chapter making references both to the creedal statements of the Council of Ephesus and to the Canon of the Roman Mass in its very first article. On the other hand, the Bishops and the theologian/authors of Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith did not use or give consideration to the title “Mother of God” in the body of their text until article 62. They then included three articles specifically on the proclamation of the Virgin as Theotokos at the Council of Ephesus, with a lengthy quote from Saint Cyril of Alexandria (n. 64).
Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII from the beginning assumed the use of the title “Mother of God”. Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith slowly built up to it.

4.2c “The Ecclesiological Movement”

According to Laurentin, some feared that the ecclesiological movement seemed to suggest putting the Virgin Mary back into a more modest place, even a minimal place. They feared that the Queen of Heaven might be reduced to the status of a simple Palestinian woman, a lowly member of the faithful in the primitive community, just one saint among others in the community of saints. As it happened, the ecclesiological movement shed a renewed light on Mary in her exemplary role for the Church, not destroying her privileges, but giving back to them their functional meaning.38

Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII — “The Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in the Mystery of Christ and the Church” — took on an ecclesiological dimension primarily, of course, by its very inclusion in The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. Specifically, the Council Fathers addressed the Mary-Church relationship in six articles, subtitled “On the Blessed Virgin and the Church.”39

i. The unique mediation of Christ.40 The Council Fathers began their treatment of the mystery of Mary in the Church by invoking the words of the Apostle: “There is one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus” (1 Tm 2:5–6). For reasons ecumenical and pastoral, the Council emphasized that “the maternal duty of Mary toward men in no wise obscures or diminishes” the unique mediation of Christ; “Mary’s mediational role originates from divine pleasure…(It) flows forth from the merits of Christ, rests on His mediation, depends entirely on it and draws all its power from it. In no way does it impede, but rather does it foster the immediate union of the faithful with Christ.”

In Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith, articles 65 through 69, the Bishops and theologians did not avoid the titles Mediatrix and Spiritual Mother. Giving much more than Lumen Gentium’s brief, hesitant mention, the U.S. Pastoral Letter quoted Paul VI’s 1965 encyclical letter:
“Since Mary is rightly to be regarded as the way by which we are led to Christ, the person who encounters Mary cannot help but encounter Christ likewise”\(^41\) and also quoted Father Fredrick Jelly, O.P. from the popular devotional Our Lady’s Digest: “Mary is not a bridge over the gap that separates us from a remote Christ... Such an approach would minimize the deepest meaning of the Incarnation. Mary’s greatness is that she brought Him close to us, and her mediation continues to create the spiritual climate for our immediate encounter with Christ.”\(^42\)

Further, Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith went beyond Paul’s earlier words to Timothy — to the place in the same epistle where the Apostle asks for “prayers, petitions, intercessions and thanksgivings”\(^{1}\) Tim 2:1). The U.S. Bishops called it “a sharing in the mission of Christ the mediator”; correctly understood, Mary’s mediatorial role, they wrote, is in perfect accord with the centrality of Christ (no. 68).

Pronouncing the “positive value” of Mary’s role as Mediatrix, the U.S. Bishops instructed that “what Mary began on earth ... she continues still, in union with the Risen Christ” (no. 69). Undoubtedly, such an approach went beyond — in volume if not in scope — that which what was found in Lumen Gentium.

ii. Mary our mother in the order of grace.\(^43\) The Council taught that Mary “cooperated by her obedience, faith, hope and burning charity in the work of the Savior in giving back supernatural life to souls. Wherefore she is our mother in the order of grace.”

Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith (no. 70–71) likewise said that “she is not spiritual mother of men solely because she was physical Mother of the Savior.” The authors chose to speak of her faith as “the secret” of her spiritual motherhood of the brethren of Christ. “She conceived in her heart, with her whole being, before she conceived in the womb. First came Mary’s faith, then her motherhood.” His “mother” is whoever hears God’s word and keeps it. All who follow become “mothers” of Christ, by their faith bringing Him to birth in others (no. 71).

Treating this topic, the Council Fathers used in one sentence the titles “Advocate, Auxiliatrix, Adjutrix and Mediatrix”\(^44\) and then quickly stated the famous warnings: “This neither takes away nor adds anything to the efficaciousness of Christ the one Mediator”; “No creature could ever
be counted as equal with” the Lord; “The Church does not hesitate to profess this subordinate role of Mary.”

*Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* did not include such forthright statements, and in fact not only presented a treatment of Saint Augustine *On Christian Virginity* (no. 72–75), extending such virginity to the members of the Church, which is a mother; the Letter also included, as stated before, four full articles explaining “the positive value of Mary’s role as mediatrix” (no. 65–69). It can be noted that, in this regard, the Pastoral Letter was less restrained than the Conciliar document. It went beyond “fleshing out” *Lumen Gentium* and approached the point of “correcting” it.

iii. Mary’s maternal intercession. The Council stated that “the consent which she gave in faith at the Annunciation and…beneath the cross…lasts until the eternal fulfillment of all the elect…Taken up into heaven she did not lay aside this salvific duty.”

Similarly, *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* stated that “it is our Catholic conviction that in her present union with the risen Christ, the Blessed Mother is still solicitous for our welfare” (no. 78) and that “as Catholics we believe that Mary was once joined to her Son’s saving work on earth; but we also believe that she remains inseparably joined to Him, associated with the intercession the glorified Jesus makes for us forever at the throne of His Father” (no. 83). The U.S. Bishops cited Eucharistic Prayer III “on their (Mary’s and the other saints’) constant intercession we rely for help”, adding that “it is erroneous to think that the intercession of Mary and the saints is necessary in the sense that we do not have direct access to the merciful Savior. We believe that having Christ, we have all things” (no. 84). However, the Pastoral Letters went on:

“It is part of God’s loving plan that, even as we help one another on earth by our prayers and deeds, so we can rely on the blessed in heaven, above all the Blessed Virgin Mary, to assist us by their prayers” (no. 84).

iv. Mary in the mystery of the Church. The Council taught, as Saint Ambrose did, that Mary is the type of the church in the order of faith, charity and perfect union with Christ. Mary is exemplar as
Mary, the U.S. Bishops, and the Decade of Silence:

virgin and as mother of the faithful “in whose birth and education she cooperates with a maternal love”.

With ecclesiotypical insight, the writers of Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith also professed that “the Church saw herself symbolized in the Virgin Mary” (no. 38). “Word of God — faith — birth of Christ: this is the pattern for the maternity of Mary and the maternity of the Church” (no. 79).

The Pastoral Letter incorporated the language of “type”, “exemplar” and “pattern” in relating Mary to the Church.

v. The Church as virgin and mother. Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII portrayed the Church as “keeping with virginal purity an entire faith, a firm hope and a sincere charity.” This the Church does by “imitating the mother of her Lord” contemplating her “hidden sanctity” and becoming mother of the faithful.

The same almost-corporeal, virginal images of a “hidden holiness” and “an integral faith, a firm hope, a sincere charity” were also used by the writers of the Pastoral Letter. Patterned after Mary, the virginity of Mother Church is fruitful, bringing forth to new life children conceived by the Holy Spirit and born of God — by the ministry of the Word and Baptism (no. 80).

vi. Mary as model of virtues. Here the Conciliar chapter offered one article. The Pastoral Letter developed twenty-eight articles, a complete chapter entitled “Mary in Our Life”.

Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII pronounced that in the Church, like Mary “already without spot or wrinkle”, the followers of Christ tum their eyes to her, who shines forth as a model of virtues …In its apostolic work, the Church looks to Mary.” Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith addressed the role of Mary as a model in the life and work of priests and religious; in family life — including the “pro-life” movement; in the lives of youth and for those who live the single life (n. 119–146). Mary as model of virtues became an important theme of the U.S. Bishops’ Pastoral Letter.

● In summary, Lumen Gentium’s considerations of Mary as ecclesiotypical in the Mystery of the Church were expanded in
Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith. The Pastoral Letter did not show the reticence about the term “Mediatrix” that had been apparent in Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII. Mary as a model of virtues was a much lengthier topic in Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith.

In a profound insight, the Pastoral Letter rediscovered that the story of Mary, as the Church has come to see her, is at the same time the record of the Church’s own self-discovery (no. 38).

4.2d “The Heilsgeschichte (Salvation History) Movement”

According to Laurentin, the theological movement centering on the history of salvation (Heilsgeschichte) seemed to absorb Mary into a broader whole. In determining her place relative to salvation, the movement seemed to put her in the background; in determining her place in salvation history, it seemed to emphasize the meaning of the whole at the expense of her “privileges”. In the end, however, the salvation history movement helped restore the historical, ecclesial, and anthropological meaning of Mary, for example, as the new Eve.50

Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII referred to the Sacred Scriptures, showing the role of the Mother of the Savior in the economy of salvation in an ever clearer light and drawing attention to her role, as in long list of episodes in the history of salvation:51

- Mary is foreshadowed in the promise of victory over the serpent given to our first parents after the fall.
- Mary is the “virgin who will conceive and bear a son, and name him Emmanuel”.
- Mary is the Immaculate Conception, the one “who was predestined to be the mother of God’s Son”.
- Mary is “a daughter of Adam, consenting at the Annunciation to the Word, becoming the mother of Jesus”; hence death through Eve, life through Mary.
Mary at the Visitation is greeted as blessed because of her belief and the precursor leaps with joy in the womb of his mother.

Mary’s virginal integrity is not diminished at Jesus’ birth; rather, He sanctified it.

Mary as Mother of God joyfully presented her newborn Son to the shepherds and Magi.

Mary, when she presented the Child in the temple, heard the prophecy that a sword would pierce her own soul.

Mary, finding the Child lost in the temple, did not understand the words of her Son.

Mary at Cana brought about by her intercession the beginning of Jesus’ miracles and public ministry.

Mary heard His preaching about those who were His true family in faith and about those blessed ones who heard and kept God’s word, as she faithfully did.

Mary persevered in union with her Son unto the cross, where she united herself with His sacrifice, according to the Divine plan.

Mary at the cross was given as a mother by Christ to His disciple.

Mary prayed, gathered with the apostles before the day of Pentecost.

Mary, on the completion of her earthly sojourn, was taken up into heaven body and soul.

Mary was exalted by the Lord as queen of the universe.52

_Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith_ did not fail to include these same images of the role of Mary in salvation history. Furthermore, as Lauretin observed, her role in the events of salvation history again turned attention to and supported Mary’s “privileges”- showing their functional purpose, again as “ecclesiotypical”, in the story of the salvation of God’s people.
(e.g. Mary’s Assumption becomes a “sign of hope and comfort” for all God’s people on their pilgrim way).

- Just as Mary did, the Church too has kept these things in her heart, pondering over them. “It is clear that to understand Mary she must be considered within the context of salvation history.” Her own history, including the privileges, mirror the salvation of the Church and its members.

4.2e “The Liturgical Movement”

Laurentin noted that the liturgical movement seemed to crowd private Marian devotions into the background, for it was concerned about proportion and coherence and preferred to stress the temporal cycle of feasts over the sanctoral cycle and even to suppress certain Marian feasts or reduce them in rank.54

*Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII had admonished “all the sons of the Church that the cult, especially the liturgical cult, of the Blessed Virgin be generously fostered” and that it be “religiously observed”. The earlier Vatican II document on the liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, had contained one paragraph on Mary and the liturgy:

> In celebrating the annual cycle of Christ’s mysteries, holy Church honors with a special love the Blessed Mary, Mother of God, who is joined in an inseparable bond to the saving work of her Son. In her the Church holds up and admires the most excellent fruit of redemption and joyfully contemplates, as in a faultless image, that which she herself desires and hopes to be.56

The cult of Mary, according to *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII, differs essentially from the cult of adoration offered to the Trinity. The conciliar chapter places various conditions on piety toward the Mother of God: it should be “within the limits of sound and orthodox doctrine”; it should be that “which the Church has approved”; “preachers and theologians should abstain zealously both from all gross exaggerations as well as from petty narrow — mindedness”; and the faithful should remember
that “true devotion consists neither in sterile or transitory affection, nor in a certain vain credulity.”

*Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* referred specifically to both *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and *Lumen Gentium*. In a sense, the paragraph referring to these two conciliar statements summarized the heart of the U.S. Bishops’ Pastoral Letter:

In spite of the urging of the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* that we celebrate the feasts of our Lady and deepen the sense of her association in the central saving mysteries of Jesus the Savior, the Church is suffering a malaise with respect to the commemoration of Mary. Two numbers, 66–67, in the chapter on our Lady deal with the cult of Mary, and are filled with practical suggestions, e.g., let the liturgy provide the lead, even for non-liturgical devotions, which are encouraged, especially those which have received the Church’s favor for a long time (no. 91).

The U.S. Bishops hearkened back to the vocabulary of the Conciliar debate but embraced a *via media* where they wrote: “A middle way is recommended between the extremes of too much and too little” (no. 91).

In the Pastoral Letter, the Bishops affirmed with the Council “the permanent importance of authentic devotion to the Blessed Virgin, not only in the liturgy … but also in beloved devotions that have been repeatedly approved and encouraged by the Church” (no. 93). The Letter mentioned the rosary and scapular as being “among these tested forms of devotion that bring us closer to Christ through the example and protection of His Holy Mother” (no. 93).

Furthermore, the U.S. Bishops stated (no. 94) that “the renewed liturgy offers immense riches”; they praised the lectionary (“contains more readings than we had before … for our Lady’s feasts and commemorations”); the new calendar (“there are more optional days on which a Marian votive Mass may be celebrated”); and Pope Paul’s missal of 1970 (“has many excellent new prayers for Mary’s feasts” and “four prefaces of our Lady”).
Even when they spoke of both revitalizing traditional forms of piety and devising new devotions corresponding to current needs and desires (no. 98), the U.S. Bishops deferred to the liturgical movement’s influence. “The liturgical season should set the tone for Marian prayers at each particular time of the year, e.g., May devotions should reflect paschal and Pentecostal orientations; Advent provides a unique opportunity for the consideration of Mary…” (no. 98). As Laurentin remarked, “New value has been discovered especially in what is the ancient traditional root and center of true Marian devotion, the place the Virgin has in the Advent and Christmas mystery — in a word, in the mystery of salvation itself.”

Yet the Bishops’ Letter was short on suggested new devotions; it mentioned several ways to effect the renewal of old devotions (the rosary and the scapular) and discussed in a general way devotions which came from the approved apparitions of Our Lady, but it was hesitant to outline or to name entirely new devotions. On the other hand, the Pastoral Letter (no. 100) did echo Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII by reminding “true lovers of our Lady of the danger of superficial sentiment and vain credulity” but did not elaborate on any of these distorted devotional practices.

- In its attempt to “reanimate” Marian devotion, Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith certainly based its case for devotion squarely on the Council’s teaching regarding the liturgy and the cult of the Virgin Mary. The U.S. Bishops’ call for a reanimated Marian devotion reflected the Council’s own approach, which Laurentin called a return to “unity and sobriety”. Given its emphasis on “return”, however, the Pastoral Letter did not go much beyond the traditional forms of devotion.

### 4.2f “The Missionary Movement”

According to Laurentin, the missionary movement — understood more broadly than simply “the foreign missions” — was concerned with reawakening in a de-Christianized world “Christ from within”; it disowned whatever “smacks of artifice … the forms of religiosity closed in on itself that a certain kind of Marian zeal had fostered.”
“The missionary movement led Mariology back to what is more important and authentic, namely the Annunciation and Visitation mysteries seen as exemplifying the Christian life … and the Council made the insight its own.”

*Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII taught that “the Virgin in her own life lived an example of that maternal love, by which it behooves that all should be animated who cooperate in the apostolic mission for the regeneration of men” (no. 65). A renewed missionary movement should echo Mary’s receiving the Word and carrying Christ into the world.

*Behold our Mother Woman of Faith* likewise saw Mary both as a model for the active apostolate near and far off and as involved in the Church’s mission even now:

> The Gospels provide few details of Mary’s life; but they do delineate a remarkable portrait of the woman who gave herself wholeheartedly to her Son and His mission in perfect faith, love and obedience. What Mary began on earth in association with the saving mission of Jesus, she continues still, in union with the Risen Christ (no. 69).

> “The Church’s mission as ‘mother of the redeemed’ was first realized in the Virgin Mother of Jesus” (no. 79) and, still today “in its apostolic work, the Church looks to Mary” (no. 80).

• *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* reflected the image of Mary’s missionary zeal — Mary, bearing the Word made flesh within herself, leaving her home and hastening across the hill country to Elizabeth. The Pastoral Letter (no. 118) again quoted the Council: “Led by the Holy Spirit, Mary devoted herself entirely to the mystery of man’s redemption.”

4.2g “The Ecumenical Movement”

The Council Fathers gave *Lumen Gentium* an intrinsic ecumenical value when they finally agreed to place the Chapter on the Blessed Virgin within the *Constitution on the Church*. In some quarters, as Laurentin noted, this emphasis on ecumenical considerations was viewed as “giving
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a civic reception to the enemy against whom the Marian movement had ‘waged the good fight.’”

Certainly, *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII can be said to have included ecumenical considerations by its emphasis on Scripture; by its very brief treatment of titles such as Mediatrix and its emphasis on Christ as the One Mediator; and by its warning that in the cult of Mary the People of God “keep away from whatever, either by word or deed, could lead separated brethren or any others into error regarding true doctrine of the Church.”

Explicitly, the Conciliar chapter on Mary, in its last article, maintained that “it gives great joy and comfort to this holy and general synod that even among the separated brethren there are some who give due honor to the Mother and our Lord and Savior” and that

The entire body of the faithful pours forth urgent supplications to (her) that she, who aided the beginnings of the Church by her prayers, may now, exalted as she is above all the angels and saints, intercede before her Son in the fellowship of all the saints, until all families of peoples, whether they are honored with the title of Christian or whether they still do not know the Savior, may be happily gathered together in peace and harmony into one People of God…(no. 69).

*Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* likewise showed ecumenical sensitivity especially by its use of Scripture — particularly by beginning with the “Our Lady in the Bible” as Chapter One. Additionally, the Pastoral Letter included a long section on the Blessed Virgin Mary and ecumenism (no. 101–112) wherein just as the ecumenical movement invited everyone to a renewed appreciation of the essentials of faith, *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* invited “our brothers in other Christian Churches to reexamine with us Mary’s place in our common patrimony” (no. 107). In another section, *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* looked beyond western Latin thought and practice and did not “neglect to mention the special honor paid to our Lady in the liturgy and theology of the Eastern rites” (no. 90).

- Laurentin mentioned that gone from *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII were “ill-adapted elements” in earlier drafts of the Council’s
schema on Mary, “such as inviting Protestants to pray to Mary to help them submit to the Pope.”\textsuperscript{65} \textit{Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith} was for the most part at least as sensitive to the separated brethren as was \textit{Lumen Gentium} Chapter VIII.

**CONCLUSIONS FROM 4.2**

From these comparisons of \textit{Lumen Gentium} Chapter VIII and \textit{Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith}, made from the perspective of the seven “movements” in the Church, the following appraisals can be made:

- \textit{Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith} — while based on \textit{Lumen Gentium} Chapter VIII — attempted to analyze and provide some suggestions for alleviating the tensions in the Marian crisis after the Council; it is therefore much longer than \textit{Lumen Gentium} Chapter VIII. Because of its length, \textit{Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith} may have become somewhat less focused on its central concern: the revival and renewal of devotion.

- Old Testament and New Testament references, especially Biblical references and imagery mentioned in \textit{Lumen Gentium} Chapter VIII, are explained at length in the U.S. Bishops’ Pastoral Letter — a positive position ecumenically.

- The Conciliar chapter and the U.S. Bishops’ letter used virtually the same patristic teaching. \textit{Lumen Gentium} Chapter VIII quoted from the Fathers and earliest centuries and employed the term “Mother of God” even in Chapter VIII’s title. \textit{Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith} moved to patristics only after considering the scriptures; the Pastoral Letter did not address the title “Mother of God” until it could be treated in its historical context.

- Both \textit{Lumen Gentium} Chapter VIII and \textit{Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith} considered Mary as a “type of the Church”. The letter forthrightly discussed Mary as “Mediatrix” and greatly expanded the treatment of Mary as the model of virtues.

- Just as in \textit{Lumen Gentium} Chapter VIII Mary is placed within the history of Salvation, so too in \textit{Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith}.\textsuperscript{66}
Faith her life and her privileges are shown in their functional roles throughout salvation history.

- Regarding the liturgy, Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith echoed Lumen Gentium’s call for public piety to return to “unity and sobriety”; but except for the U.S. Bishops proposal to expand the Mysteries of the Rosary neither document explored specific forms of new devotion.

- Offering some specifics for our time, the U.S. Bishops’ Letter demonstrated the important role of Mary in the “mission” of spreading the Gospel, just as Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII highlighted Mary as an example for those (both clergy and laity) who cooperate in the Church’s apostolic mission.

- For the most part, both documents showed ecumenical sensitivity; however, the expanded treatment of the title “Mediatrix” in the Bishops’ letter was perhaps ecumenically questionable.

Finally, it can be seen that in these two documents the Church’s teaching on Mary has been approached not deductively but from a position at the center of the mystery of salvation. These were not simple “proofs” about Our Lady, even as Lumen Gentium did not intend to answer all questions about Mary, and Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith became a much more extensive presentation on Marian doctrine and devotion.

A greater depth of vision into Marian devotion was to come in an exhortation from Pope Paul VI. By analyzing the Pastoral Letter’s teaching — especially on devotion — and by using Paul VI’s “aspects of” and “guidelines for” Marian devotion, the question may be answered: How well did Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith anticipate Marialis Cultus?

4.3 Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith and Marialis Cultus

As early as March, 1969,

Pope Paul VI asked sorrowfully whether the present evils in the Church were not due to the fact that Vatican II with its emphasis on the Church had not failed to develop ideas essential to the personal practice of religion …
Mary, the U.S. Bishops, and the Decade of Silence:

“We ought therefore to do two things: first, we ought to make a closer study of the Council’s teachings and second, we ought to bring them into harmony with that essentially religious, mystical, ascetical and moral patrimony of doctrine which the Council in no way repudiated”

At the Vatican, on an early January day in 1974 — less than two months after Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith had been promulgated — Pope Paul VI was presented with a leather-bound copy of the U.S. Bishops’ Pastoral Letter. When Monsignor John J. Murphy, director of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, DC, handed the book to him, Pope Paul warmly commented that he too was writing a document on the Blessed Mother. The Pope put the book aside and said with a smile, “I will not read it for now, so that you will not think I have borrowed any material from this document.”

Marialis Cultus, an Apostolic Exhortation “for the right ordering and development of devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary”, was prepared from 1970 to 1974 during the same time the U.S. Bishops had been preparing their Pastoral Letter. While both documents are responses to the decline in Marian devotion, Marialis Cultus is like LG VIII much shorter; it did not attempt a full presentation of Mary doctrine, as Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith sought to do. Marialis Cultus was, above all, about devotion.

Additionally, the language and tone of Marialis Cultus is much more positive than that found in the U.S. Bishops’ letter. The Pastoral Letter uses language such as “abruptly”, “suffering a malaise” and “our distress and concern”; Marialis Cultus points to “changes in our time”, “temporary confusion” and a “development in Christian piety.”

After an Introduction and Part I on “Devotion to Mary in the liturgy”, Marialis Cultus addresses in Part II its major intent — “the renewal of devotion to Mary.”

The Second Vatican Council also exhorts us to promote other forms of piety side by side with liturgical worship … this shows the need for Episcopal conferences to promote genuine creative activity and proceed to a careful revision of … piety toward the Blessed Virgin.
COMPARISON OF TONE/LANGUAGE

BYMWF (91–98):

We have passed abruptly to near silence… The Church is suffering a malaise with respect to the commemoration of Mary.

In writing this Pastoral Letter, our concern about Our Lady is most keenly felt in the area of devotion. We view with great sympathy the distress our people feel over the loss of devotion to Our Lady and we share their concern that the young be taught a deep and true love for the Mother of God… not only in the liturgy, but also in the beloved devotions.

We offer some suggestions… above all, the renewed liturgy. Yet Our Lady has been honored by amazingly rich extra-liturgical forms. It is unwise to reject them without a trial simply because of the accusation that they come from the past … ill-suited to sophisticated moderns.

Under the guidance of the Holy Father and the Bishops, we must revitalize old forms and devise new devotions corresponding to current needs and desires.

N.B. "ABRUPT"/ "SUFFERING MALAISE"/ "CONCERN"/ "GREAT SYMPATHY"/ "DISTRESS"/ "LOSS"/ "UNWISE"/ "REJECT WITHOUT A TRIAL"/ "ACCUSATION"/ "ILL-SUITED"/ "SOPHISTICATED MODERNS"

MC (Introduction):

In our time, the changes that have occurred in social behavior, people’s sensibilities, manners of expression in art and letters and in the forms of social communication have also influenced the manifestations of religious sentiment.

Certain practices of piety that not long ago seemed suitable for expressing the religious sentiment of individuals and of Christian communities seem today inadequate or unsuitable because they are linked with social and cultural patterns of the past… In some, this may cause temporary confusion.

But anyone who, with trust in God, reflects upon these phenomena discovers that many tendencies of modern piety are meant to play their part in the development of Christian piety in general and devotion to the Blessed Virgin in particular. Thus our own time, faithfully attentive to tradition and to the progress of theology and the sciences, will make its contribution of praise to her whom, according to her own prophetic words, all generations will call blessed.

N.B. "IN OUR TIME"/ "CHANGES IN BEHAVIOR, SENSIBILITIES, ART, LETTERS, COMMUNICATION - TION"/ "NOT LONG AGO SUITABLE … SEEM INADEQUATE, UNSUITABLE"/ "TEMPORARY CON FUSION"/ "TRUST GOD"/ "DEVELOPMENT OF PIETY"/ "ATTENTIVE TO TRADITION"/ "PROGRESS OF THEOLOGY AND SCIENCES"

The U.S. Bishops had attempted to do something similar. How well did they anticipate Marialis Cultus ‘ “principles for action in this field”:
Mary, the U.S. Bishops, and the Decade of Silence:

- “aspects of devotion to the Blessed Virgin” (i.e. Trinitarian, Christological and Ecclesial) notes that are intrinsic and essential to Mary’s relationships with God and with the Church

- and the four “guidelines for devotion to the Blessed Virgin” (i.e. Biblical, Liturgical, Ecumenical and Anthropological) considerations which accentuate our bond to Mary?

4.3a The Trinitarian Aspect

Marialis Cultus instructed that devotion to Mary should express a Trinitarian note that is “intrinsic and essential” to it:

In the first place it is supremely fitting that exercises of piety directed toward the Virgin Mary should express the Trinitarian and Christological note that is intrinsic to them… Christian worship in fact is offered … to the Father through Christ in the Spirit.72

In Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith, the U.S. Bishops wrote that when treating the doctrine of the Virginal Conception, for instance, “what really matters here is the manner in which God in fact chose ‘to send his Son in the fullness of time’” (no. 44); the Letter repeats Hippolytus’ third century creed: “I believe in God, the Father almighty, and in Christ Jesus, Son of God, who was born of the Holy Spirit of Mary the Virgin” (no. 45) so that, with Mary’s faithful cooperation, the loving graciousness of the Triune God has offered mankind a fresh beginning in Christ, the new Adam (no. 46).

The importance of the Trinity in Marian devotion was understood when the Pastoral Letter proclaimed, for example, that “the riches of the rosary are of permanent value”, for among those riches are “the Apostles’ Creed and the occasional repetition of the ancient and simple doxology” (no. 96), both of which are fundamentally Trinitarian prayers.

Specifically, Marialis Cultus added “a reminder of the fittingness of giving prominence in (Marian) devotion to one of the essential facts of the faith: the Person and work of the Holy Spirit.”73 Without including the Holy Spirit, any devotion would not be Trinitarian. Behold Your
Mother Woman of Faith reflected that it is “the Holy Spirit (who) leads the Christian people… in the celebration of the mystery of Mary in the liturgy and other prayer…” (21). The vivifying power of the Holy Spirit overshadowed Mary in the Annunciation and Incarnation (n. 27 and 48), so that throughout her life, she was “led by the Holy Spirit in everything” (n. 69).

The Pastoral Letter gave its lengthiest teaching on the Holy Spirit when it considered “Mary and Ecumenism”:

Another matter we might profitably explore together as Christians is the bond between Mary and the Holy Spirit. Christ sent His Spirit as the new Advocate, as the Intercessor who comes to help us in our weakness. Any correct understanding of Mary’s role must be seen in connection with the predominant role of the Holy Spirit (no.112).

Paul VI went farther and exhorted theologians to “meditate more deeply on the working of the Holy Spirit in the history of salvation” and that “such a study will bring out the hidden relationship between the Spirit of God and the Virgin of Nazareth” (LG 27). Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith did not fully anticipate Paul VI’s call.

- In summary, the U.S. Bishops Trinitarian emphasis — even without a fuller treatment of the role of the Spirit in Marian thought and devotion corresponded with the rest of Marialis Cultus: Mary, favored by the Father and Mother of the Son, is the “Temple of the Spirit”, an expression that empathizes the sacred character of the Virgin, now the permanent dwelling of the Spirit of God.”

4.3b The Christological Aspect

Marialis Cultus stated clearly that in the Virgin Mary everything is relative to Christ and dependent on Him. In conformity with the spiritual orientation of our time, which, as Paul VI said, is dominated and absorbed by the “question of Christ”⁷⁵, expressions of devotion to the Virgin should give particular prominence to the Christological aspect.⁷⁶
Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith did not fail to highlight the indissoluble link and essential relationship of the Virgin to the Divine Savior in genuine Christian piety, as Lumen Gentium likewise taught.\textsuperscript{77} All is relative to Christ: her role in the Scriptures, her Immaculate Conception, her Perpetual Virginity, her path in faith, her Assumption and her share in heavenly glory. The Pastoral Letter (no. 81) repeated several times and in multiple ways the Council’s teaching from the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy: “Blessed Mary is joined by an inseparable bond to the saving work of her Son.”\textsuperscript{78}

Further, the undeniable centrality of Christ in Marian prayers and devotions was clearly stated by the U.S. Bishops (no. 83): “As Catholics, we believe that Mary was once joined to her Son’s saving work on earth; but we also believe that she remains inseparably joined to Him, associated with the intercession the glorified Jesus makes for us forever at the throne of His Father (Heb 7:25)”. The mysteries of the rosary, for example, link our Lady to her Son’s salvific career” — the joyful events, His sorrowful suffering and death, the glories of Easter, His Ascension, Pentecost, the Assumption, and Mary’s coronation. All rely on and relate to Him. Accordingly, such prayer and devotion “also increase(s) the worship due to Christ Himself” and in a type of language found in Marialis Cultus but avoided in Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith:

what is given to the handmaid is referred to the Lord; what is given to the Mother redounds to the Son …and thus what is given as humble tribute to the Queen becomes honor rendered to the King.\textsuperscript{79}

- In sum, the Christological aspects of devotion called for in Marialis Cultus are found in the teaching of Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith. Devotion to Mary must be Christocentric; from beginning to end, the mystery of Mary is bound up in the mystery of Jesus Christ.

4.3c The Ecclesiological Aspect

Marialis Cultus taught that “it is also necessary that exercises of piety… should clearly show the place (Mary) occupies in the Church,”\textsuperscript{80} which is “the highest place and the closest to us after Christ.”\textsuperscript{81} Different forms
of devotion to the Blessed Virgin should everywhere be open to ecclesial perspectives of the fundamental nature of the Church, as “the Family of God”, “the People of God”, “the Kingdom of God” and “the Mystical Body of Christ.”

Clearly *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* included this ecclesiological aspect in its Marian thought and devotion — particularly in portraying Mary as an ecclesiotypical figure in prayer and celebration:

- Mary is the model of the Church at the Cross (no. 37);
- Mary’s holiness is a sign of the love of Christ for His Bride the Church … The Virgin Mary is the most excellent fruit of the redemption a figure of the spotless bride of Christ, which is the Church (no. 56).
- In Mary taken to glory, to union with Christ, the Church sees herself answering the invitation of the heavenly Bridegroom (no. 60).

These are images discovered anew for both liturgy and devotion.

In *Marialis Cultus*, Paul VI recalled that “the active love at Nazareth, at the house of Elizabeth, at Cana and on Golgotha … finds its extension in the Church’s maternal concern.” In the devotional life, this concern can come from a lively meditation on Mary in the Scriptures and, for example, in mysteries of the holy rosary. Love for the Church becomes love for Mary, and vice versa. Re-animating and rediscovering traditional devotions as well as formulating new devotions must take place within the context of the Church whether the devotions be “ever ancient” or “ever new.”

*Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* spoke not only of the needs in our own day, but also of the “beloved devotions that have been repeatedly approved and encouraged by the Church” (no. 93).

- It was clearly a goal of *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* to bring the ecclesial dimension of Marian thought and devotion to the fore. From the beginning, members of the Bishops’
Conference were insisting that the Pastoral Letter on Mary have an ecclesiological basis.

In regards to popular piety, Marian devotion — outside an ecclesiological context — could not be revised in its forms and texts in a fitting way.\[86\]

*Marialis Cultus* stated that four guidelines (scriptural, liturgical, ecumenical and anthropological) were to be kept in mind in any revision of exercises of piety or in the creation of new devotions, in order to accentuate the bond which unites us to Mary, who is Mother of Christ and our Mother in the Communion of Saints.\[87\]

The appearances of three of these guidelines in *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* have already been considered. Now they are specifically examined in regards to Marian devotion:

4.3d The Biblical Guidelines

*Marialis Cultus* proclaimed that today, “every form of worship should have a Biblical imprint… Modern Christians use the Bible ever increasingly as the basic prayer book… Devotion to the Blessed Virgin cannot be exempt from this general orientation of Christian piety… It should draw inspiration in a special way from this (Biblical) orientation in order to gain new vigor and sure help.”\[88\]

The Biblical orientation of *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* has already been demonstrated (see 4.1 on “Chapter One: Our Lady in the Bible” and 4.2a on “The Biblical Movement”); however, beyond a dutiful use of texts from Sacred Scripture, more is necessary. What is needed is that the texts of prayers and chants should draw their inspiration and the wording from the Bible, and above all that devotion to the Virgin should be imbued with the great themes of the Christian message.\[89\]

This is what the U.S. Bishops seemed to be suggesting, for example, when they mentioned that new sets of mysteries for the rosary based on the Scriptures were possible; and “that newly-devised rosary vigils with readings from the Old Testament as well as … the introduction of
hymns…and periods of silent prayer” were renewed ways of Marian prayer, always using the Bible (no. 97).

4.3e  The Liturgical Guidelines

*Marialis Cultus* offered liturgical guidelines for devotion to the Blessed Virgin and recalled the norm laid down in the Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium*:

> It is necessary that such devotions with consideration for the liturgical seasons should be so arranged as to be in harmony with the sacred liturgy. They should somehow derive their inspiration from it, and because of (the liturgy’s) preeminence they should orient the Christian people toward it.90

Already *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* had called for the liturgical seasons to set the tone for Marian devotion (see 4.1 on “Chapter Four: Mary in Our Life” and 4.2e on “The Liturgical Movement.”)

*Marialis Cultus*, moreover, went on to say that it is sometimes necessary to change long-standing customs wherein the real nature of Christian worship has been somewhat obscured. The authors of *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* generally refrained from calling for specific changes in most long-standing customs, perhaps because they felt that too many customary devotional practices had already been changed or even dropped.91 As shown during the “decade of silence”, there were pastors who — as Paul VI put it — with “scorn … forget that the Council has said that devotions should harmonize with the liturgy, not be suppressed; they leave them aside and create a vacuum which they do not fill.”92

On the other hand, the Pastoral Letter’s authors made no mention of those who Paul VI would chide for “insert(ing) practices of piety into the very celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. This creates the danger that the Lord’s Memorial Rite, instead of being the culmination of the meeting of the Christian community, becomes the occasion, as it were, for devotional practices.”93
The authors of *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* tended to be like “the wise pastoral minister (who) would point out and emphasize the proper nature of liturgical acts and at the same time enhance the value of practices of piety.”

### 4.3f The Ecumenical Guidelines

Paul VI wrote in *Marialis Cultus* that “devotion to the Mother of God has acquired an ecumenical aspect.” The authors of *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* had also written about it (see 4.1 on “Chapter 4: Mary in our Life” n. 101–112 and 4.2f on “The Ecumenical Movement”).

Catholics unite with the Orthodox churches in venerating the glorious Theotokos; they unite with Anglicans whose theologians underline the importance of Mary’s place in the Christian life; they are united, too, with their brethren in the Churches of the Reform, where love for Sacred Scripture flourishes. Paul VI wrote, “We wish to express our confidence that devotion to the humble handmaid of the Lord, in whom the Almighty has done great things, will become, if only slowly, not an obstacle but a path and rallying point for all who believe in Christ.”

Echoing *Lumen Gentium* Chapter VIII, both *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* and *Marialis Cultus* warned that care should be taken to avoid any exaggeration on the part of Catholics that could mislead separated brethren concerning true doctrine; but *Marialis Cultus* — not concerned with simply “reanimating” devotion but with the “right ordering and development” of devotion — instructed that any manifestation of cult opposed to correct Catholic practice should be eliminated.

Again, *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* did not address the subject of what to do about devotions which may have been “opposed to correct Catholic practice.” Any such corrective acts were the duty of individual Bishops; the “joint” Pastoral Letter could not make binding recommendations for such cases. But the call was clear — for the sake of Catholic devotion and with the ecumenical movement in mind.
4.3g The Anthropological Guidelines

Marialis Cultus’ anthropological guidelines were the document’s most original and most challenging. “Devotion to the Blessed Virgin must also pay close attention to certain findings of the human sciences,” Paul VI wrote, because of “the discrepancy existing between some aspects of (Marian) devotion and modern anthropological discoveries.”

Paul VI contended that the image of the Virgin presented in certain types of devotions cannot easily be reconciled with the modern lifestyle, especially the way many modern women live. He pointed to four areas:

- in the home, where women’s equality and co-responsibility with men in the family is increasing;
- in politics, in many countries where women have gained a position in public life equal to that of men;
- in the social field, where women work in a whole range of employments outside the home;
- and in the cultural field, where new possibilities are opening up for women in scientific research and intellectual activities.

The Pope realized that some people have become disenchanted with devotion to the Blessed Virgin and find it difficult to take Mary of Nazareth as an example because the horizons of her life seem so restricted. Marialis Cultus instructed theologians, pastors and the faithful to examine difficulties such as these with care.

The U.S. Bishops had hinted at allaying this “disenchantment” when they wrote that “rhythmic prayer is not alien to modern man” (no. 97) and that “this is an age avid for symbols” (no. 92). Also, devotion ought to be part of “Mary and the Priesthood” (no. 119–122); “Mary and Religious Life” (no. 123–128); “Mary and Family Life” (no. 129–142); “Mary and Youth” (no. 143–144); and “Mary and Single Life” (no. 145).

Paul VI pointed out 1) that the Virgin Mary has always been proposed as an example to be imitated, not in the type of life she led or for her socio-cultural background, but rather for the way in which she fully accepted
the will of God; 2) that the Church does not bind herself to any particular expressions of an individual cultural epoch, less they be unsuitable to men and women of different ages and cultures; and 3) that using both the Sacred Scriptures and the human sciences, we see how Mary can be considered a mirror of the expectations of the men and women of our time. Thus, it can happen that

- The modern woman anxious to participate in her community’s decision-making will joyfully imitate Mary who gave active and responsible consent to God in an event of world importance — the Incarnation;

- The modern woman can see Mary’s virginity as a courageous choice;

- The modern woman can be surprised to see Mary not as a timidly submissive woman, but as the one who proclaims the Magnificat, vindicating the humble and the oppressed;

- The modern woman will recognize in Mary a woman of strength, who experienced poverty and suffering, flight and exile;

- Mary will be seen not as a Mother concerned only with her own Son, but as a woman helping to strengthen the whole apostolic community’s faith in Christ;

- Mary will not cause disillusion among men and women of our day, but offer the perfect model of discipleship;

- Mary the disciple builds up the earthly, temporal city while on pilgrimage to the heavenly eternal city;

- Mary the disciple works for justice for the oppressed and charity for the needy; and above all, Mary is the disciple who is the active witness of that love which builds up Christ in people’s hearts.

Again, Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith had taken some small steps in this anthropological direction (no. 142), teaching that the Mother of Jesus is portrayed in the Gospels as:

- intelligent (the Annunciation, “How can this be?”);
• apostolic (the Visit to Elizabeth);

• inquiring and contemplative (the child lost in the temple);

• responsive and creative (at Cana);

• compassionate and courageous (at Calvary);

• in sum, a woman of great faith (no. 142).

The U.S. Bishops stated that “these implications in the lives of Jesus and Mary need to be elaborated into a sound theology on the role of Christian women in contemporary Church and society” (no. 142). Women in the contemporary Church, however, had almost no role in the writing of Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith. A sound theology also needed to be put into practice.

Such a theology would offer new insights into expressions of Marian devotion.104

CONCLUSIONS FROM 4.3:

• The U.S. Bishops in Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith anticipated only partially the call in Marialis Cultus for the necessity of Trinitarian and Christological aspects in Marian devotion. A fuller pneumatology was lacking.

• The Bishops’ Pastoral Letter, like Paul VI’s Apostolic Exhortation, embraced the Council’s call (as well as the urging of their fellow U.S. Bishops) to emphasize the ecclesiotypical aspects of Marian thought and piety.

• Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith seemed to foresee Paul VI’s biblical guidelines for increasing the use of the Word of God in Marian devotion.

• The authors of the Pastoral Letter recognized ahead of time the importance of liturgical guidelines for exercises of Marian piety;
however, the Pastoral Letter did not contain many creative ideas for new devotions.

- The *ad hoc* committee for the Pastoral Letter seemed, from the beginning, to have a somewhat keen *ecumenical* awareness, pointing out that care should be taken in devotions so that attentive non-Catholics may not be led into error.

- Finally, by comparison *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* suffered from a lack of *anthropological* vision. The “Mary in Our Life” section was appropriate, but seemed a bit of an “afterthought.” Anthropological considerations could have helped answer early questions about the decline in Marian devotion and the “silence” during the critical decade. Even in the process of writing the letter, the perspectives of minorities, perhaps especially U.S. Catholics from Hispanic, African or Asian backgrounds with strong devotion to Mary, would have been helpful.105 Other Pastoral Letters at the time were regularly consulting women.106 It would have been helpful to seek the input of women religious, mothers, wives, etc., before and during the writing of *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*.

All in all, it cannot be said that *Behold our Mother Woman of Faith* fully anticipated *Marialis Cultus*’ delineation of all the theological “aspects” and devotional “guidelines” for Marian piety. The U.S. Pastoral Letter was very faithful to *Lumen Gentium*, its authors bound to follow the Conciliar document. Yet the *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* writers were generally “in tune” with Paul VI’s post-Conciliar Apostolic Exhortation pointing to an acknowledgement of historical reality of the “Marian crisis” of the time. Additionally, all three magisterial documents demonstrate a common awareness of the theological “movements” that had been leading up to them for as long as a century. Each was appropriate for its time and in its circumstances.

Having analyzed *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* based on the Council’s teaching *before the letter* and Pope Paul VI’s teaching *after the letter*, the final chapter draws some conclusions about *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*’s implementation — and its validation — as the U.S. Bishops sought to revive and renew Marian devotion.
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The proposed Pastoral Letter on Women, in the late 1980’s and early 1990’s, called for such a theology, but did not develop any further. The Bishops’ experience while attempting to write it attracted strong opposition from the right and the left and demonstrated the difficulty in articulating such a theology on the roles of women in the modern Church and world.

Over a decade earlier, U.S. Bishop (later Cardinal) John Wright had said, “It becomes daily, perhaps we should say hourly, more clear that the destinies of all the Americas are inextricably entwined … I think it timely and urgent that I preface your academic, scholarly sessions by a plea that you watch for opportunities in your teaching, writing and preaching to stimulate devotion to Our Lady of Guadalupe…” Message to 1961 convention of the Mariological Society of America, in Mary Our Hope: A selection from the Sermons, Addresses and Papers of Cardinal John J. Wright, R. Stephen Almango, OFM, ed., (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1984), 106–7.

Pennington is too extreme when he writes “Ours is still very much an androcentric church, dominated by a patriarchal mind that places the female under the male. Within such a mentality it is not possible for the most important collaborator of the Redeemer, the first of the disciples, to emerge, fulfilling her role precisely as a woman … The full historical reality of Mary the woman cannot emerge within the tradition of a male-dominated Church.” Pennington, Mary Today… 46.
Chapter 5 — Conclusion: The Time after

**Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith**

Mary had the privilege of belonging to each of the three phases of the time of grace before Christ, during Christ’s lifetime on earth, and after Christ. Not only did she participate in each of these three phases, but she seems to have had a privileged role in the transmission of one to the next, a factor that brings her mission into harmony with the essence of time itself.

_R. Laurentin_¹

What were the effects of *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*? One can attempt to trace them from the November 14, 1973 Mass at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, concelebrated by the U.S. Bishops, during which Cardinal Carberry formally announced the publication of the Pastoral Letter. He preached in his homily:

> We hope the Pastoral Letter will find its way into the homes of the faithful … We ask that it be studied in our schools at all levels … that our pastors and priests … our theologians, our Mariological societies and Marian publications, that all of these will give it their study and communicate its contents to our beloved faithful.²

This final chapter, however, recalls Cardinal Newman’s insight that often people expect too much from history:

> We must have a little faith. Dogmas … were not struck off all at once but piecemeal — one Council did one thing, another a second, and so the whole of the dogmas was built up. What at first looked extreme — with controversies rising — led to another, and another Council, and they did not reverse the first, but explained and completed what was first done … Some expect more from history than history can furnish and have too little confidence in Divine Promise and Providence.³

Accordingly, the measurably “modest” effects of *Behold our Mother Woman of Faith* should be seen not only from the perspective of the present time, but also from the perspective of its own time, its own
mieu. Accordingly, the time after the letter’s promulgation should be examined for both

5.1 the implementation of Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith and

5.2 the validation of the Pastoral Letter.

The search for “validation” — i.e. agreement, support, endorsement, resonance — includes examples of the use of the U.S. Bishops’ letter by several other national Bishops’ conferences; the positive public reactions to the Pastoral Letter in light of Marialis Cultus; the corroborating statements on “popular piety” in the Apostolic Exhortation Evangelii Nuntiandi in 1975; the 1978 election and long reign of Poland’s Karol Wojtyła as “Mary’s Pope” John Paul II; and the Mariology of the Conciliar theologian Joseph Ratzinger as Pope Benedict XVI — even some thirty years later.

The validation served to place Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith within the framework of the Magisterium of the time; after all, the time frame for these four events — from November 1973 (Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith) to October 1978 (John Paul II) — was not even five years, much less time than “the decade of silence” which preceded it.

5.1 The Implementation of Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith

The U.S. Bishops’ Pastoral Letter received attention in the national and diocesan press. In a lead editorial in Homiletic and Pastoral Review, Father Kenneth Baker, S.J. wrote: “I urge you to order a copy of this inspiring letter today, to study it carefully and to do what you can to implement it.” Daniel Durkin, O.S.B., the editor of Sisters Today, wrote in the Spring of 1974: “If you’re looking for an extra-special treat for your month of May basket …some of Mary’s sons and lovers have put their devotion to her on paper.” Father Titus Cranny in The Lamp called it “perhaps the most important document that the Bishops of our country have ever issued.”

The Bishops’ Conference permitted it to be reprinted in its entirety in L’Osservatore Romano, Queen, and The Marian Era. It was translated into Spanish (Aqui a Tu Madre: La Mujer de Fe) for some
dioceses in the U.S. The Bishops’ Conferences of Latin America, CELAM, asked to distribute it in their countries; the U.S. Bishops happily gave permission. A translation was prepared for French-speaking Canada (Voici ta Mere, La Femme de Foi) and another for Italians (Ecco tua Madre, Una Donna di Fede). Permission was requested to distribute the Letter to the Catholics of Kerala, India; and there is some indication that it was translated and distributed to Catholics living in Communist Hungary. The Knights of Columbus’ magazine, Columbia, ran lengthy excerpts of Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith.

The Bishops on the Board of Directors of National Shrine in Washington, D.C. — led again by Cardinal Carberry — appointed a ten member “Committee for the Implementation of the Pastoral Letter.” Nine of the ten members chosen to direct the implementation were women religious, serving on the new committee as “consultants”. They came from a variety of catechetical positions: from the Superior General of an order, to a formation director, CCD directors, teachers at the pre-school primary, grade school, and high school levels; those who led teacher training and audio/visual departments; and those involved in campus ministry and the Newman apostolate.

When the Implementation Committee first met in January and February of 1974, its first stated goal was to “create a climate of receptivity” for the Pastoral Letter. Sister Joan Noreen, C.S.J., assistant to the Director of the Shrine, gave a presentation on Reflections in Mariology: An Aid to the Implementation of Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith, in which she noted that “contemporary pedagogy for Mary must never overlook the obvious, namely, that this person is a woman.”

Before the end of 1975, the committee of Sisters had developed an entire program in Liturgical Catechesis on Mary.

Three books came out of the implementation of Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith

- The first, Month of May: Models for Devotional Services and Instruction Sessions was a document from the National Shrine’s “implementation committee”. It was copied and distributed to a handful of dioceses throughout the country. To be used as
liturgical catechesis on Mary during the month of May, the models were prepared for young children, junior and senior high school students, young adults and older people. The Pastoral Letter is quoted in prayers and reflections throughout. At the beginning of each section, the (unknown) authors reminded users that two documents had been used as a source for development of these models, namely, *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* and *Marialis Cultus*.22

- The second book, *To Preach, To Teach, To Pray Mary*23 was written by Father James J. Flood, a member of the theology faculty at Saint Charles Borromeo Seminary in Philadelphia. It is comprised of seventeen outlines for homilies, arranged according to the Marian observances in liturgical calendar of the Roman Rite. In the author’s Preface, Father Flood wrote:

> These pages are primarily intended as homily outlines to aid and assist priests to preach on the Blessed Virgin Mary in a manner which is both contemporary and convincing. The original source material for these outlines … was the presentation of the person of Mary in *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*.24

- The third book to grow out of the U.S. Bishops’ Pastoral Letter was *Mary’s Journey* by Father Louis J. Cameli, a priest of the Archdiocese of Chicago. Published by Sadlier, the book

> contemplate Mary’s life as a journey… her Jewish origins in her childhood home… the angel’s announcement… her motherhood and parenting… the crucifixion of her Son… (her presence) in the early Christian community… and at its journey’s end, another beginning.

Along with the book, Sadlier offered a kit for Marian catechesis at ages 6–8 and 9–12, and for junior high, for young adults, and for adults and families. Again, the catechesis was liturgically based; the approach and the content were creatively “anthropological.” *Mary’s Journey*25 was republished in 2003.
Additionally, a John Carroll University professor of religious studies produced a 10-program videotape series, “Behold Your Mother”, based on the Pastoral Letter. The Television Center of the Diocese of Rockville Centre, N.Y. produced the color 20-minute programs for children. Teaching about Mary was necessary for children, Dr. Joseph F. Kelly said, because “Mary’s role, grossly exaggerated in the past, lately has been the exact opposite.” The tapes featured Christian art and history.

5.2 The Validation of the Pastoral Letter

5.2a Validation from Marialis Cultus and Other Bishops’ Letters

Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith did not find itself “alone” in the Catholic world of the middle 1970’s. Important papal documents, as well as the later appearance of other Bishops’ Pastoral Letters about Mary, validated the work the U.S. Bishops had done.

The Bishops of Australia decided to publish Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith and Marialis Cultus together.27 James Cardinal Freeman wrote in the Forward:

Since devotion to the Mother of God is part of our Faith and not merely a pious addition, it follows that her name should be constantly on our lips and love of her consistently in our hearts. At the same time that devotion should be authentic, devoid of pious exaggeration and theologically based.

The Australian Bishops said they hoped to promote greater devotion to Mary while indicating some of the directions such devotion should take.

As priests, we would all do well to take to heart the words of Marialis Cultus: “We express the hope that thanks to your generous commitment there will be among the clergy and among the people entrusted to your care a salutary increase of devotion to Mary with undoubted profit for the Church and for society.”28
The U.S. Bishops’ Conference had received copies of *Marialis Cultus* in Latin and in English from the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Jean Jadot, on March 11, 1974. The Apostolic Exhortation “for the right ordering and development of devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary”, was sent as usual to the Bishops’ Conference early and under embargo “until 8:00 A.M. EDT on March 22nd”, at which time it would be released to the press world-wide by the Vatican.29

More than a week before its release, a copy of *Marialis Cultus* was forwarded to Father Carroll by Father Kelly of the NCCB, in order to help Cardinal Carberry make a statement to the press about the Vatican document’s relationship to the U.S. Bishop’s Pastoral Letter on Mary. Father Carroll noted in his reply to Father Kelly:

Inevitably, I made mental comparisons … The Roman document is magnificent, with some great strengths, but perhaps also a few weaknesses. I do not think it is strong ecumenically, but its part on Mary as a model is very good. The liturgical stress is thorough and buoyant. I do not find much of a biblical or historical development (perhaps it was not intended after *Lumen Gentium*’s compact treatment).

Thank you for letting me see the beautiful document. I do hope it gets very wide dissemination, it can serve our own people here in the U.S. as a marvelous complement to points made in our own pastoral. It is more strongly exhortatory than ours.30

Cardinal Carberry, in a press release from the National Catholic News Service, said — according to the headline — that the “Papal Document on Mary Augments (the) American Pastoral.”31

Cardinal Carberry told NC News that the American bishops “concentrated on the wealth of dogmatic teachings concerning Mary in an effort to try to fathom the mystery surrounding the Mother of God. The Pope, in a manner of speaking, zooms right down to the practical devotion to Mary.”

“Not only does the Holy Father augment the things we could only touch upon in a few paragraphs, he shows that the
traditional teachings of the life and role of Mary, that is, the dogma we spoke of, are so well founded.”

The press release mentioned that “the American Bishops and the Pope worked on their documents separately”; it emphasized that “both speak of ecumenism and Mary as a model for women.” Regarding ecumenism, Cardinal Carberry said to the press:

Both documents reinforce the teachings of the Church in clarifying and illuminating the place of Mary today. Not only is this so important for realistic ecumenism, but time and time again our non-Catholic Christian friends have told us: ‘Do not water down Catholic doctrine.’ Only in being honest can the hoped-for unity be realized.

Regarding Mary as a model for the women of today, Cardinal Carberry commented that

Even though Mary was not involved in many areas of concern for modern women, such as social, domestic, political or cultural fields, Mary is always a valid model for any woman who sees value in being faithful to her mission.

Just as *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith* preceded *Marialis Cultus*, a flurry of Bishops’ writings — which had been quantitatively negligible for nearly ten years (see Chapter 3.3c in this paper) — reappeared in the annual compilation of Pastoral Letters, *Lettere Pastorali* shortly after Paul VI’s Apostolic Exhortation. Even though “Mary most holy” had disappeared as a topic in 1966–67, by the time of the 1974–1975 edition the list included not only *Marialis Cultus* and *Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith*, but also:

The Pastoral Letter *Mary and the Church* by Cardinal Tarancon of Madrid;

The Polish Episcopacy’s *Major Points for the Cult of the Blessed Virgin*;

*The Virgin Mary and the Young*, a Pastoral Letter by Cardinal Gonzalez Martin of Toledo;
and later:

*Mary Mother of the Church, Mother of Christ and Mother of His Mystical Body*, a Pastoral Letter by Giacomo Beltritti, the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem;

Archbishop Elias Yanes Alvarez of Zaragosa *Mary of Nazareth, Virgin and Mother*;

and the West German Bishops’ Conference Pastoral Letter, *Mary Mother of the Lord*

It is highly indicative of the period that, in the 1974–1975 collection of Pastoral Letters, “Maria SS” returned as a topic in the “Prospetto del volume.”

### 5.2b Validation from *Evangelii Nuntiandi*

From the 1974 Synod of Bishops on Evangelization — the first of the “twin” synods on “evangelization” and “catechesis” (the latter in 1977) — came the Synod’s reflection that expressions of popular piety were for a time regarded as less pure and sometimes despised, but today they are almost everywhere being rediscovered. During the last Synod the Bishops studied their significance with remarkable pastoral realism and zeal.

On the Solemnity of the Immaculate Conception in late 1975, Paul VI issued *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (*On Evangelization in the Modern World*), the Apostolic Exhortation based on the Bishops’ observations at the 1974 Synod. Father Thomas Thompson, S.M. noted the effect of the Synod which produced a new interest in popular devotions. *Evangelii Nuntiandi* spoke of them as “particular expressions of the search for God and for faith, both in the regions where the Church has been established for centuries and where she is in the course of being established.” Popular piety has many positive qualities: it manifests “a thirst for God which only the simple and poor can know … It involves an
acute awareness of profound attributes of God: fatherhood, providence, loving and constant presence … Furthermore, it engenders interior attitudes rarely observed to the same degree elsewhere: patience, the sense of the Cross in daily life, detachment, openness to others, devotion.” When well-oriented, this popular devotion can provide “a true encounter with God in Jesus Christ” (*Evangelii nuntiandi*, no. 48).³⁴

The Pueblo documents and others from the Latin American Episcopal Conference continued developing the role of popular devotions both as part of the new evangelization and for the inculturation of Catholic values.³⁵

During the same period, Harvey Cox, iconoclastic author of *The Secular City*, also rediscovered the positive value of popular devotions. In his 1973 book, *The Seduction of the Spirit*, Cox admitted that

> for years I had lamented the nostrums and delusions inherent in the faith of impoverished and defeated peoples. Only recently have I begun to see that the religions of the oppressed are also their guarantors of psychic survival, inner dignity and persistent hope.³⁶

“In the ten years” since *The Secular City*, Cox had come “almost full circle” in his attitude toward religion and its significance for poor and oppressed peoples.

Into that milieu — a renaissance of thought about popular devotion, not only in poor areas of the world — *Evangelii Nuntiandi* was mindful that

> Pastoral charity must dictate… the proper attitude in regard to this reality, which is at the same time so rich and so vulnerable. Above all one must be sensitive to it, know how to perceive its interior dimensions and undeniable values, be ready to help it to overcome its risks of deviation.

This exhortation about “pastoral charity” toward the people’s devotions was addressed first of all to Bishops.
During this same era, Mary was “returning” in the Catholic charismatic movement in the U.S, which eventually attained strong elements of devotion to Mary in many of the charismatic communities; also, the topic of Mary became part of the liberation theology movements, particularly feminist theology which — while rejecting some Marian values — at least brought Mary into the discussion. And although none of the Mariological Society of America’s annual meetings addressed the topic of the U.S. Bishops and Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith, a 1978 speaker maintained:

The future is hopeful, indeed more hopeful, than at any time since the close of the Second Vatican Council. Not the least evidence of improvement is the fact that many members of the American hierarchy are urging the faithful to a greater devotion to the Blessed Virgin.

The words of the U.S. Bishops’ Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith — certainly validated but somewhat muted, and rightly so, by the volume of the magnificent Marialis Cultus — nonetheless found further genuine validation in the years of Evangelii Nuntiandi and the birth of the Church’s “new evangelization.”

5.2c Validation in the Marian Direction of John Paul II

A final validation in this period of less than five years came late in 1978, following the sudden death of Pope John Paul I. On October 16, 1978, Cardinal Jean Villot stood in front of Cardinal Karol Wojtyla’s place in the Sistine Chapel and asked the Polish prelate, “Acceptasne electionem?” And Cardinal Wojtyla answered: “In obedience of faith before Christ my Lord, abandoning myself to the Mother of Christ and of the Church, and conscious of the great difficulties, I accept.”

Less than an hour later, from the central balcony of Saint Peter’s Basilica, the new Pope — with the city and the world watching and listening — again referred to the Mater ecclesiae:

And so I present myself to you all, to confess our common faith, our hope, our trust in the Mother of Christ and of the
Church, and also to start anew on this road of history and the Church, with the help of God and with the help of men.41

In one hour, it seemed as if Mary as the Mother of the Church — an “old” controversy from Conciliar days — had been, if not resolved, at least endorsed in a way that Paul VI had expected from all the Bishops at the Council.42

This renewed Marian orientation was not only heard, but also seen. “It was not hidden,” Father Johann Roten, S.M. wrote. “It was plainly visible on his papal coat of arms” - a sturdy letter “M” underneath the cross beam — “and expressed in the short and challenging motto ‘Totus tuus.’”43 Overlooking Saint Peter’s Square, soon a mosaic of Madonna and Child would appear on a high wall, with the words “Mater ecclesiae” beneath, to stand for centuries.

Father Carroll44 has cited Donal Flanagan’s assessment that “it was left to the persuasive vigor and persevering tenacity of John Paul II to recall the Church effectively to its Marian heritage.”45

It could be seen in his very person. “The life and work of this extraordinary Pope show that a well-integrated devotion to Mary can attract others.”46

In many places, in many ways, John Paul II preached to the world as he preached to the people of Honduras early in his pontificate:47

“Behold your mother” … the pilgrim Pope repeats Jesus’ words to you. Welcome her into your home; accept her as a mother and a model. She will teach you the ways of the Gospel. She will make you know Christ and love the Church; she will show you the path of life; she will encourage you during difficulties. In her the Church and the Christian find reason for consolation and hope, because she “shines forth on earth, until the day of the Lord shall come, as a sign of sure hope and solace for the pilgrim People of God” (LG,68).

The “pilgrim” Pope repeated Jesus’ words over and over again, validating — after a decade of crisis — devotion to Mary: “Behold your Mother.”
5.2d Validation from Benedict XVI

Three decades after the critical period of “silence” had ended, John Paul’s close collaborator and successor, Joseph Ratzinger — the German conciliar theologian who had long served as Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith — validated the Christological, ecclesiological and anthropological considerations present in Mariology since the time of the Vatican II:

If the place occupied by Mary has been essential to the equilibrium of the faith, today it is urgent, as in few other epochs of Church history, to rediscover that place. It is necessary to go back to Mary if we want to return to that “truth about Jesus Christ,” “truth about the Church,” and “truth about man.”

Benedict XVI’s words could easily have been applied to the reasons for and the writing of Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith.

FINAL CONCLUSION.

The “silence about Mary” was indeed real. Yet Mary did not disappear — could not disappear. Even in silence, Mary was present. The British Bishop Alan Clark of East Anglia described her place:

Mary is not the center of Christian living and dying, but she is found at the center and leads us to the center. It is the Holy Spirit who transforms us into the Body of Christ; but she is integral to that Body.

Despite the silence, a new “voice” could be found, one based on the Council’s emphasis on the Mary-Church relationship. Wolfgang Beinert wrote: “In reality, Marian devotion had not ceased; it was called to a new orientation.”

That new orientation was based on Lumen Gentium Chapter VIII.

In order to end the “decade of silence”, Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith had a role to play in not only reviving but also renewing devotion
to Mary — not rejecting older forms of devotion, but at the same time suggesting new. As Beinert wrote to pastors, to Bishops:

Pastoral wisdom requires quarrying treasures old and new. Only thus are both kept spiritually alive … Where there’s a will, there’s a way. Marian devotion is not a fad, but a path leading to God’s heart.51

Old devotees could find renewed devotions; new devotees could discover valuable old devotions.

As was noted in Chapters 4 and 5, after Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith, the Church’s teaching about devotion to Mary was considerably enriched by the writings of Popes Paul VI and John Paul II. In 2003, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops reissued Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith.52 Included in the volume were the Marian writings of two Popes: along with Paul VI’s Marialis Cultus, were two documents by Pope John Paul II — his 1987 Encyclical Letter Redemptoris Mater and his 2002 Apostolic Letter Rosarium Virginis Mariae.

Interestingly, John Paul brought to life a suggestion made in Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith. The U.S. Bishops had written:

Besides the precise rosary pattern long known to Catholics, we can freely experiment. We have customarily gone from the childhood of Jesus to His Passion, bypassing the whole public life. There is rich matter here for rosary meditation …53

The U.S. Bishops had called for the renewal of the rosary; John Paul II broadened this simple, yet profound devotion to include the mysteries of Christ’s public ministry between his Baptism and his Passion.54 After all, Marialis Cultus had urged the Bishops to “promote genuine creative activity” and “to proceed to a careful revision of … piety directed toward the Blessed Virgin.”

The Bishops of the United States and their theologians, especially Father Eamon Carroll, had anticipated John Paul’s 2002 letter by thirty years.
Mary, the U.S. Bishops, and the Decade of Silence:

In this sense, the Pastoral Letter was instrumental for change, even if the change was not immediate. The very fact that it became the “Bishops Conference’s all-time best seller” demonstrates that the thin volume was widely in the hands of teachers and students — and in the homes of many U.S. Catholics. That the USCCB reprinted it as a teaching document in 2003 points to the Letter’s on-going value.

At the same time, the Pastoral Letter serves as documentary proof of the U.S. Bishops’ reaction against possible oblivion of Marian devotion after the Council — a very difficult ten years not only in the United States. The style, the content and the history of Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith say much about the milieu of the “decade of silence”.

The “silence about Mary” did come to an end. In the United States, devotion to her was no longer the loud crescendo of voices heard at mid-twentieth century; yet after that crescendo — and after a crisis-filled decade of silent “rest” — the Bishops of the United States called for a new hymn to be sung to her whom, according to her own prophetic words, all generations will call blessed.

---------------------------
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ORAL HISTORY –
INTERVIEW — EAMON R. CARROLL, O CARM
with Reverend John T. Myler
Dayton, Ohio

POST-VATICAN II PERIOD

I’ve often been asked to what do I attribute the extraordinary fall off of public devotion to Our Lady and general interest in her. And here’s my reading of it: What even the great historians seem to have overlooked was that after every major Council in history, there was a great letdown — without exception!

After the First Vatican Council those who felt “let down” were the older priests, because they had been used to doing things in a rather non-authoritarian way. So back then it was the young priests who were all gung-ho after Vatican I for a more authoritarian way of doing things. That set the tone. The older men, and they were not bad men at all, but their way of doing things was much gentler, softer. This can be documented very easily, even in popular literature. After Vatican I there was an enormous build-up of interest in Our Lady, which peaked in the 1930’s, the 1940’s, well into the 1950’s, before the Second Vatican Council.

However what historians seem to have forgotten was that there has been that great explosion in one or the other way after every major Council.

And of all the aspects of Roman Catholic life and piety — especially piety — there was no aspect of Catholic piety that was stronger or more evident than devotion to Our Lady. And it was precisely here that the seams broke.

Something had to give. There was a lot of unrest in the Church, there’s no doubt whatsoever of that — an enormous unrest. It was like a seething volcano. And it blew up in this direction, in an extremely common, recognizable aspect of Roman Catholic life, which was devotion to Our Lady, in all its manifestations.
THE MARIOLICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

At that time I was deeply into the field, because the Mariological Society had been founded in 1949, and I was very much part of it — especially taking part in our annual conventions, which went on year after year — in spite of the difficulties. We continued to produce good things. If you look at the rundown of the fifty volumes — more than fifty now — you’ll see that there were many first-rate articles and some of the best scholars in the country, including scripture men, were involved in the Society and contributed notably. Good work was still going on.

Look at the Presidential Addresses given at each convention, especially those right after the Council. They are very illuminating but they are not gloomy! They faced the situation and made suggestions for what might be done about it.

Already in 1967, the president for a couple of years was a man who was a good friend of mine, Father William Most. He’s gone to God. His presidential addresses in ’67 and ’68 are really very strongly stated — in terms of the people he disagreed with. (That was his characteristic.) He thought there had been a terrible “sell-out”, despite what the Council said about Mary. The talk in ’68 was “Mariology and Academic Freedom”. Remember that not long before that had come the “Land-o-Lakes” declaration in 1967; the presidents of the Catholic universities were at that meeting. And Fr. Most did not approve of it! And he publicly took strong exception to it — stronger than many people would take. That was his outlook.

The talk he gave in 1967 had simply been titled “The State of the Union” — a cover term.

So you see, we were addressing the problem.

TEN CRUCIAL YEARS

It was a ten year period — let’s say 1964–1965 to 1974–1975 — that was the nadir. It was the most crucial time. This crisis about Mary was the most evident sign of trouble in the Church. Along with the problems in the liturgy, the rise of feminism — and I’m using it as an ugly term. There were people who were experts and had every right to speak. But some nuns, for example, who had absolutely no training in theology whatsoever, suddenly became “experts”. Some basically “took over”! And they were the ones the press talked to, and very often they had very little regard for Mary. (The press listened to people like Rosemary
Ruether, whom I regard as an extremely dangerous person — denying Catholic beliefs, e.g. the Blessed Virgin’s lifelong virginity, etc. I’ve said this in print — not quite so strongly as that. But on occasion she was the one invited by Sisters to tell them how to reform.)

Good priests didn’t know what to say, in part because the Council documents were not read! The Council documents are “technical” documents. They really require explanation. And a lot of the wealth of them is in the footnotes. The ordinary busy parish priest did not have access to those footnotes (even though you could buy the set of sixteen original documents for fifty cents, I recall!) Footnotes were given, but not filled in. They sold well — but they were not read!

Our people are not readers, and our priests are not readers. (I speak for religious as well as diocesan priests.) It’s unfortunate, but that’s the way it is. At our most recent Mariological convention, the Redemptorist Father S. Marento gave a talk in which he said, “The community library is where you put books.” And that’s all that happens to them often!

The Council documents desperately needed to be studied and expanded — and still do!

WHY A DECLINE IN MARIOLOGY?

It was devotion and teaching and preaching about Mary that had to give — because that was so obvious and so dominant! It was such a major feature of American Catholic devotional life. It seems to me that it was indeed the most obvious feature. If you met a well-meaning Protestant and asked such a person “What do you regard as very characteristic of your Catholic neighbors?” the answer would certainly be “The Blessed Virgin”. Don’t you agree? It wouldn’t be what we think of the Eucharist. (And you might say, “How would you characterize a Protestant?” The normal Catholic would say, “They read the Bible.”) So, if you had a sign, a mark as a Catholic, I think it would have to be devotion to Mary. A medal — or a scapular (It was a custom that children at First Communion received the brown scapular of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel) — or the rosary.

That’s the way I read it.

ECUMENISM

Ecumenical concern was necessary and overdue, but the ecumenical aspect was sort of “dragged in” in a sense, to justify the
failure to talk about Our Lady. It many times included a disrespect for the role of Mary — as if we could win over our brother and sister Christians by neglecting our common Mother!

Yet at the time, there was a growing interest — ecumenically — in Our Lady. The Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary was founded in 1967 in England. The American group was started in 1976. This extremely interesting organization has found a unity about the Blessed Virgin in a number of respects. Now that’s a good development after the Council. But for people to say, “I’m not going to talk about Our Lady because the Council has instructed us that we have to be open to our Protestant brothers and sisters” — that’s absurd!

THE BIBLICAL AND LITURGICAL MOVEMENTS

We must keep in mind that in the Bible there’s not a great deal about Our Lady — so very little about her life; but in terms of Our Lord’s life there’s not a great deal either! The gospels are not biographies, not even of Jesus, and even less about Our Lady. They are “good news” documents, they are not biographies. Most people accept that if it is called to their notice. What we begin to discover — and this work is done by people who look into it carefully, Catholics and Protestants — is an enormous stress on the meaning of the life of the Mother of Jesus in scriptures.

Unfortunately, the sad reaction after the Council — during that desperate decade especially — was the feeling that we’d been instructed by the Church, by the Fathers of the Council, to be open to our Protestant brothers and sisters and so, in so many minds, that meant “Let’s play down Mary”. And that’s what happened.

Liturgically (and I wasn’t involved in parochial ministry, I was teaching and even in my own Carmelite house I didn’t have formation responsibilities) they were desperate years — abolishing devotions; taking out the statues; the shift of the liturgy; the panic and the abandonment of popular Marian devotions; the dreadful new music; incompetent musicians and so forth.

And the embarrassed silence by preachers and teachers. This most of all. I think the atrocity stories were mostly made up: I don’t doubt that some of them happened, that some asinine priest tore up a rosary in the pulpit, but the silence was more damning!
Thinking back on that time, what saved me was that I was so totally involved in my teaching work and lecturing all over the country. This kept me happily occupied.

Christology, which I was also teaching, had a difficult time of it — and the whole teaching on original sin (which has always been rather complicated) these also underwent challenges. And morality, of course. Now, the challenges were very often good ones! Actually, it led to a sort of purification of theology.

The times were restless; the ‘60’s into the ‘70’s, in America — and around the western world generally — were incredibly restless, and the Church was not spared.

**OUR LADY IN THE VATICAN II DOCUMENTS**

Well, I wasn’t part of the Council. I would have loved to have been. What the Council Fathers chose to do — by ever so narrow a vote in 1963 (there was a lot of canvassing, on both sides) when they decided to treat the Blessed Mother not in a separate document but in the Constitution on the Church — was almost unanimously approved when the final document was voted on in 1964. It wasn’t just a political issue. This wasn’t a game, like a sports game. “We won by one touchdown…” No!

I do remember one Bishop, not long after the initial 1963 vote, who said to me “I voted for a separate document. And the reason I did (I wasn’t questioning him, he simply volunteered this information) was that I felt people would feel that we had let Our Lady down.” And that was the feeling that some had.

I think the incorporation into the larger document was a very wise move. Extremely wise.

I’ll have to look it up in the Acta of the Council, but I read recently that the present Pope, John Paul II, who was a voting Council Father of course, wanted the chapter on Our Lady to be the second chapter, not the eighth. That can be tracked down.

In any case, I think the way it turned out was marvelous. (There had been an attempt to close the first session with a ringing statement about Our Lady. That failed.)

But what bothers me about the Council statements is that two extremely important things were subsequently overlooked:

One was the capital place of the Blessed Virgin in the first Vatican II document, the 1963 Decree on the Liturgy, #103. Our Lady is inseparably joined to the saving work of Christ.” You cannot state it any
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more strongly! In the earthly life of Jesus, in His Mother’s earthly life and her present association with the Christ who lives forever, to make intercession for us — you cannot say it more strongly!

The second overlooked teaching of Vatican II is chapter seven of Lumen Gentium on the Communion of the Saints, which is a very “peaceful” chapter. Some of the problems that the eighth chapter meets in going out of its way to explain that if we talk about Mary in a mediatory role it’s not at the expense of the One Mediator, none of that fear is in chapter seven.

It’s calm. It’s a magnificent chapter! Almost unstudied.

A NEW DEFINITION? NO!

I’m not in favor of any more definitions, by the way. Not at all. One of my reasons is, we’re not doing too well with the ones we have! Another reason is that the Catholic people already have, and believe in practice if not formally, exactly what the Council said in 1963: “Mary is inseparably joined to the saving work of Christ.” Now that statement doesn’t have the attractiveness of the single term. A single word (such as Mediatrix and/or Co-Redemptrix) has enormous attraction. People ask me that if this work has been my life — that is, the study of the Blessed Virgin Mary — how come I don’t want another definition. I’m afraid of “bandwagonism”. Let me explain.

There are people — and they’re good people — who feel that another definition regarding Our Lady would add another jewel to her crown. Well, yes and no. What I’m suspicious of there is bandwagonism. In other words, having gotten the dogmatic definition of the Assumption in 1950 (I was there on the steps of St. Peter’s when it happened) they figure let’s get on the bandwagon and add another.

Do you know that there’s hardly been another serious study of the Assumption since 1950? We haven’t taken that statement and let it develop into all its manifestations and consequences! The only book I know was written by the former Carmelite General who had been my teacher at one time, Kilian Healy, who did a book on the Assumption of Our Lady (now out of print). It’s the only whole single book on that topic that I’m aware of. Now that’s in fifty years!

Another thing is that the Assumption was no more true on November 2nd in the year 1950 that it was on October 31st of the same year! Making it a dogma doesn’t make it any more true. And people forget that.
You know, most of the things we believe are not dogmas. The early dogmas (such as “Mother of God”) in the early Church were truths about Our Lord that were under attack. Defensively, the Church had to state them in a form that we recognize as dogma.

Our Lady’s association with the saving work of Christ — whether it be described as Mediatrix or Co-Redemptrix (a term I particularly do not like, because “co-” to an American ear sounds like “co-signer of a checking account”) — these terms could add nothing to it.

I respect the people who hold that these titles should be declared as dogmas, but I don’t share their view.

I don’t believe that doctrines reach the stage of dogma simply because a lot of people sign petitions, which is today part of the movement toward a new definition.

**ATTEMPTS DURING THE EARLY ‘70’S**

The attempt (other than the Bishops’ letter) that involved me most intimately was led by the famous Father Albert Boedekker, who died at the age of ninety in January 1994, a Franciscan from San Francisco, whom I regard as the prime mover behind the American Bishops’ letter. He wanted me to take a leave of absence from Catholic University and go around the whole country — he set it up — for half a year talking on Our Lady. So, I did speak in almost every state — from January until the summer of 1971. This was an attempt to meet the fear.

He was the pastor of St. Boniface in San Francisco. He was a great apostle of the poor. He founded the “St. Anthony Dining Room” as he called it. At the moment it feeds up to two thousand people a day at a sit down dinner. And the money is raised entirely by contributions — nothing from the Church, nothing from the state. He was probably the best-known man in San Francisco. He was even proposed for the Nobel Peace Prize.

He and his secretary set up this lecture tour for me. I hit almost all the states. I gave virtually the same talk everywhere. It was very Biblical and used Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium* chapter eight, etc. Very much along the lines of what was later written in the Bishops’ letter.

**THE THEOLOGICAL CONTEXT**

In 1970, Father Alban Maguire, a Franciscan — a fine theologian — said, “The five years since *Lumen Gentium* seem like a century and the memory of what took place may become a little blurred... In spite of the
assurances of the Fathers, there are many who continue to insist that the Council played down Our Lady’s role in the Church. On the other hand, the theologians who have given concentrated attention to chapter eight of Lumen Gentium are finding more and more meaning and relevance in its teaching.”

He was very realistic, but not gloomy. He said, “There can be no doubt that devotion to Mary has diminished since the Council, but it would be well for us not to assign causes for this until we have weighed the phenomenon more carefully.”

With thirty years gone by, we can see that it wasn’t what the Council said — there were other reasons the explosion took place. Donal Flanagan (who, though no longer active as a priest, has kept an intelligent interest in Mariology) has spoken about the post-Conciliar period.*

The other reasons? I reflect on the question, “Was Mary’s place in serious integrated theology and theological instruction in fact that good?” I lived through that pre-conciliar period. Often enough, the consideration of Mary, even in major manuals, was by way only of a corollary, a corollary “pietatis”. It wasn’t integrated! It’s true, devotional life was very, very rich and abundant, no question. But in terms of solid theology, I’m not at all convinced that it was being done that well. So, when people talk about “the good old days”, the good old days were often not the good old days. If you try to work along with bad theology, you’re gonna pay for it!

In 1971, the MSA Presidential Address was given by Bishop Austin Vaughan. He was a fine and holy man (but it was hard to get a manuscript out of him). The talk in ‘72 was by Charles Neumann. He was a Marianist, now gone to God, a very clear writer whose talk was on “The Decline in Mariology as a Theological Problem”. Nothing could be more apposite for your concern — the build-up to the American Bishops’ document.

THE SILENCE ON MARY

When we were talking about this letter, when it was in the planning, Father Alfred Boedeker, OFM pointed out he was a native German speaker. He grew up in the San Francisco area, and spoke German even at home, as a child. So he had very good German context, and he said Hitler’s plan, with respect to Christianity, was “Wir schweigen ihm tod” or “We’ll silence him to death” — say nothing about Christ! Extremely
effective — the same thing that Aldous Huxley said in that wonderful novel “Brave New World”: The most efficient thought control is silence about the truth.” And so the silence was far more damning, far more dangerous than open attack on Mary. If Our Lady were attacked, that’s at least a sign of interest. And it can be defended and you can win over people! But you cannot fight silence!

And there was a wall of silence about Mary. I lived through that time. It was very effective. I’m not saying it was deliberate, by and large, but the results were the same. “We’ll silence her to death.”

And that experience was an important reason for getting this letter out.

THE GROUP BEHIND THE LETTER

In 1970, at the time of the first unofficial meeting of the group proposing this letter, the crisis point had not yet been reached. The Council had ended in ’65. The most recent articles I’ve seen have spoken of a “decade”, a very bad decade — say ‘65 to ‘75.

The idea for the letter came about half way through that decade.
(Our letter was being done at the same time the Roman letter — Marialis Cultus — was being done. I knew it was being written: I was asked to be part of it. But by the time that invitation came, I was totally involved in our own.)

Cardinal Carberry, absolutely, was the key figure among the Bishops, far and away, in proposing and facilitating the writing of “Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith”. He made sure that we could meet with him. He would bring us to St. Louis and put us up and so forth. It didn’t happen very often (since the Bishops were regularly coming to Washington) but I remember at least a couple times going to St. Louis.

He was a member of the Mariological Society of America, even as a simple priest. He had been for a long time a bona-fide member of the Society.

The first meeting took place at the National Shrine in Washington. I returned from Rome in ’55 and within 2 years I was taken on full-time by the Theology Department at Catholic University. About the same time, I was put on the Iconography Committee of the National Shrine (and I served on that committee until I left Washington in 1980). So, one reason I was hired was that I had done my doctorate in Mariology, specifically in Mariology. My topic was a Belgian Carmelite by the name of Arnoldus Bostius who died in 1499. A very interesting period. He did
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a big book, in Latin of course, on the relationship between Carmel and Mary. And so my thesis topic — I did it at the Gregorianum — was on his doctrine. He had a “humanistic name” — he was very involved with humanism. He corresponded with Erasmus and other people. He wrote his beautiful book at a very tense time — it was the eve of the Protestant Reformation and the exploration of the New World. That was the basis of my doctorate.

I was put on the Iconography Committee because of my expertise in the theology about Our Lady. I was teaching full time at CU; sometimes as many as a hundred students in the same room. It did marvelous things for my voice, it really did! I learned how to fill a room!

So because of my theological expertise and because of my association with the Iconography Committee with the Shrine, I was asked when Carberry called the very first meeting (he was in town for another meeting).

The other Bishops were Baum (now Cardinal Baum, whom I saw not too long ago), Maloney from Wichita, Dougherty from Newark, and the Shrine rector, who was at that time Msgr. McDonough.

Eventually on the Bishops’ Committee were Manning (subsequently Cardinal) of Los Angeles and Medeiros (subsequently Cardinal) of Boston.

THE START OF THE WRITING / THE MARIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

I was asked to be the first to put pen to paper. I was very familiar with the Council documents, of course; they had been out for at least 5 years already. Lumen Gentium came out in ‘64 and the one on the Liturgy came out in ‘63. There was plenty of material and I was deep into the field. I was sent to Rome precisely by my religious order to become an expert in Mariology; I stayed on in Rome and taught in our own house for 4 years — I was in Rome for 6 years — so meantime I did a tremendous amount of reading and keeping up in the field.

When the Mariological Society of America began, I was abroad, so I wasn’t at their first meetings. (In those days we couldn’t come home every year; we could come home every third year. So I came home after 2 ½ years and I was home for 6 months.) During that time at home, I went to the meeting of the Mariological Society, which used to be in early January. I increasingly took an active part in it. I met all the people in the field here in the United States. We had a very good working
relationship with exegetes and systematic theologians, right from the very beginning, in the Mariological Society.

**BISHOPS ON THE COMMITTEE**

I’m sure that Carberry wasn’t pursuing this idea of a letter on his own. The Bishops’ president, Cardinal Krol, was involved.

I was with Manning, Irish-born, (and very Marian in his outlook) in 1976 in the enormous Archdiocese of Sydney, Australia. There was a two-week Congress on Our Lady. Cardinal Freeman organized it. Father Boedekker found a benefactor who paid the way for Charlie Neumann, the Marianist, for John McHugh, an English exegete, for Ross Mackenzie, the Presbyterian, for Fr. Frederick Jelly, OP, and for myself and Archbishop Manning — and Cardinal Daly from Ireland — to go there for two weeks. It was incredibly well-organized. Throughout this enormous diocese, we were parceled out to go and give talks on Our Lady. Usually evening gatherings of lay people, and families would turn up with the kids in their pajamas. It was terrific! Absolutely marvelous! (The Australian Bishops reprinted “Behold Your Mother” with a supplement about Mary in Australia.)

Medeiros, as well, was very Marian. I think most of the Bishop’s committee members had pastoral letters about Mary in their archdioceses.

There was discussion, early in the game, about having a “pulpit talk” at the beginning of the letter, but it was never thought of as being just by itself, as I recall. It was always going to be a letter to “open up” what the Council had said — that “fleshed out” the footnotes. That was the intention. Easy-to-read, and based on what the Council had said.

**SCHOLARS ON THE COMMITTEE**

Richard Kugelman was a Passionist, a top rate scholar. And at the time we began this letter, he was President of the Catholic Biblical Association. He’s gone to God a good many years. He was very competent. It was very important to have the scripture man there, and he was as good as anyone in the country.

Fr. Frederick Jelly was my extremely close, good friend who died just two years ago at 73. He had already been working in ecumenical materials and he was part of our group in Australia.
Monsignor Thomas Falls’ work is in one of the volumes of the early Fathers of the Church; he was able to come to only a few meetings, I think, because he was ill. He was much involved with the Legion of Mary, which was a very good background.

Hugh O’Connell was a Redemptorist from Liguori and a friend of Carberry. He lived near him. He ended up doing the “questions for discussion” in the document. Also he was very insistent that we include the section “Mary in the Single Life”. Very important, I think. Mary is a model for women who live a single life in the world as a true vocation from God. I’m glad it was included; it’s an especially valuable part. We all know women of that nature, maiden aunts who take care of relatives, and unmarried gentlemen as well. It’s not obligatory to get married.

I was the “anchor man”; I would do the basic texts and submit them to these others; for example, Kugelman, I would trust him for the scriptural part very much. But the actual composition devolved on me. If people know my style, they find it here. And I was teaching double full-time; full-time in my house and full-time at CU! It was a young man’s game!

But I lived in a Carmelite house with people like Roland Murphy; Ernest Larkin, a classmate; Chris Ceroke, a classmate. All top rate scholars. In a good sense, we lived a very controlled life. We might have an hour’s recreation — then we’d all go to our rooms at 8 o’clock — and work!

And they all knew that I was part of the group preparing a letter for the Bishops’ Conference. They were probably sick of hearing about it! There was no secrecy about it. From the beginning, never did anyone, Carberry nor anyone else, say “You’re not supposed to talk about this.”

This meant that I could consult theologians and scholars; I could ask their advice. There were others in the Mariological Society, in which I was so deeply involved by then, who were available or offering suggestions.

THE REPLIES OF THE BISHOPS

Some of the Bishops’ letters! Fulton Sheen thought it was a bit drab! It surely wasn’t his style. But the suggestions from the Bishops were good ones. Sometimes they were somewhat picayune. But by and large, they were quite good. Sometimes they were stylistic, which was perfectly all right — asking for greater clarity and so forth.

(I have a file with all the various Bishops’ replies.)
THE NEW EVE

It took some convincing to justify the order in chapter two. We start off with “the new Eve” (which could have been expanded, but what’s there is good) and we don’t get to “Mother of God” until we’ve already discussed several other things. That’s the way Marian doctrine developed historically. We had to defend that! And one of the Bishops who backed us up on that was Baum. In my judgment — and the other Bishops on the committee were good theologians — Baum was particularly alert to the nuances. We speak of “The Mystery of Mary”. Baum defended that very strongly; some of the Bishops who wrote in were unhappy with that phrase. But Baum defended it very strongly.

In the discouraging days right after the Council, the “new Eve” concept was under attack by the extreme feminists. Very much so. They said, “The ordinary woman is Eve! So to call Mary the new Eve is at the expense of women.” That’s a very strong feminist contention. But it totally ignores history. I’ve heard some women make these incredibly uninformed statements about the whole new Eve concept. Read Pelican, he has a whole chapter on Mary as the new Eve. “Mary Through the Centuries: Her Place in the History of Culture”. His second chapter is “The New Eve and the Guarantee of Christ’s Humanity”. Extremely well done. He simply faces what he calls the “a-historical attempts to reject the whole new Eve tradition as hopelessly anti-woman.” He argues for fairness. One doesn’t have to defend stereotypes, but “historical justice demands that both sides of the dialogue be included.” Then he points out “the same authors who are castigated as irremediably ‘patriarchal’ offered a strong counterpoise in their even more extensive interpretations of woman, as embodied in Mary the woman of valor (mulier fortis), who as descendant and vindicator of the first Eve, crushed the head of the serpent and vanquished the devil.”

It has to be said very strongly. When I read an author who immediately attacks the whole Eve/Mary comparison, I would say that writer obviously doesn’t have much respect for history or for Scripture. But it’s become one of the points of the attack and a badge of some feminist thinking, and Pelican really zeroes in on that.

If I were doing this letter again, I would probably give a much larger section to the new Eve, but as it is, it’s two paragraphs. And it also has some very rich implications for the understanding of the Church. The Church is also the new Eve. I regard it as an extremely rich point.
VIRGINITAS IN PARTU

And we simply decided deliberately not make a point of the very mysterious virginitas in partu. Because the Council did not! The Council chose to say that in being born, Jesus hallowed His Mother’s virginity. It makes no decision whether this was miraculous or not. And that’s my view as a theologian. Not all theologians would agree with me. But I regard that as a very defensible view. (I had a married man in one of my courses someplace or the other who said that to insist that the virginitas in partu was a physical miracle simply disregards how important the whole experience of giving birth is.) So, as a theologian, I have accepted the way the Council puts it. And they wrestled with it! Fair enough. And enough!

I don’t think we do the truth a service by insisting that the perpetual virginity (virginitas post partum) has been dogmatically defined. It has been taught by the Church — consistently — and I think it is binding teaching, but I don’t think it’s a dogma. If you have to use the term “dogma”, use it exactly. “Ever-virgin” is not a dogma, but it is no less true!

A French group Le Groupe des Dombes that has been meeting has just put out “Mary in the Plan of God and in the Communion of Saints”. The English is out — Spring 2002. It’s very well done. In terms of Our Lady’s life-long virginity, they point out that a Protestant outlook in general would not be favorable to that, yet they say: But it may well be! A beautiful piece of work! How fitting Mary’s lifelong virginity is, even though most Protestants don’t accept it — all the “founding fathers” without exception do — Luther and Calvin, Zwingli, John Wesley — all of them without exception regarded Mary as remaining a virgin. What they rejected was calling on the saints in prayer: That became a Protestant hallmark and remained such. And their reasons were often not silly reasons. And not just angry reasons. They had some good doctrinal reasons. They were reacting to some excesses.

MORE ON BISHOPS’ REACTIONS

The Bishops were given some of the preliminary drafts to react to them. Copies of all the Bishops’ responses were sent to the members of the committee. The replies came from no means one hundred per cent of the Bishops. Maybe 30 per cent.
There was no Bishop who replied negatively and said “No go.” Because they all knew — they were aware of the changes in the Church — that people were upset, they weren’t hearing about Our Blessed Mother anymore, devotions were being canceled, and so forth. Surely they were aware of that, and so the letter would be a service to the American Church.

THE ROSARY CONSIDERATIONS

We did offer some suggestions for the rosary — and that provoked some angry letters. In paragraph 97, we say, “Besides the precise rosary known to Catholics, we can truly experiment. New sets of mysteries are possible.” Among the people who wrote in and liked it was Frank Duff, the founder of the Legion of Mary. He was delighted, absolutely delighted. Now, of course, it’s common to have variety in the rosary. Today, Bishops are writing letters suggesting that be done! But some very ultra-conservative people were upset by this. And that’s a sign of just how understandably fearful people were. But it’s in the letter anyhow, thank God.

On the other hand, it would have been ecumenical-overboard to suggest praying only the first part of the Hail Mary on each bead. That’s very Protestant! That’s a Protestant reading of the Communion of Saints.

I can sympathize with the Protestant problem there. If I had grown up as a Protestant, and I had devotion to the Mother of God, to imitate her and all the rest — by training, I do not ask her for help! Because that’s betraying my Reformation roots!

For example, at the Ecumenical Society, we have prayers in common. We’ll say the Magnificat together, we’ll say the first part of the Hail Mary together. But you don’t “put this on” people. It would be wrong to “put this on” people. What they choose to do privately, that’s another matter.

Any suggestions that we Catholics trim the Hail Mary to drop the second part is wrong.

But our suggestion for other rosary mysteries was well said, and that is what is being done!

RAYMOND BROWN, S.J.

When the letter first came out, in the “suggested readings”, one of them is Ray Brown’s, “The Virginal Conception”. I knew Ray Brown
(he died 8 Aug 1998, God be good to him). I knew him very well. In the question period I had before the Bishops’ Administrative Board right before the letter came out, somebody in that group — I think it was a lay person — made a case “How in the world do you dare to put that man’s name there?”

And they’re still after him! The fact that the Holy See put him on all sorts of committees, that he opened up the meaning of the scriptures to the entire world, that doesn’t count at all for some people! He doesn’t sing the song the way they sing it.

THE REGIONAL VOTE OF THE BISHOPS

Some of the Bishops on the committee handled the letter’s presentation for final vote in their own regions — twelve areas, as I remember — and some of the rest of us were “farmed out” to different areas. For example, I remember the Benedictine Bernard Theall (“Theall” is an unusual Irish name), he was our stylist and a very fine one; and a very fine man. He went to the Bishops in the Detroit area, as I recall. He explained to them what was in this letter.

By all means, discussing this letter at their regional meetings was very beneficial. We were anxious, since it was the Bishops’ letter, that no Bishop be put in the position of saying, “I didn’t know what was going on.” The country is so very big, it’s difficult to do it properly, but every effort should be taken to avoid that danger.

This letter is a result of the Council document — and intended to be so. To meet the need. For there was this astonishing and deplorable, very sad fall off in public devotion to Our Lady, and enormous confusion in spite of the Council.

“Mary is inseparable from Christ” — that was the best approach to take from any standpoint — ecumenically as well. The part of the letter on the Scriptures, that is particularly valuable, because for most Catholics it was wonderfully new. “Fleshing out” what the Council documents said. The Council documents are skeletal and desperately need to be fleshed out. That’s what we attempted to do throughout this letter. Particularly in “Our Lady and the Bible”. It put us on the scene, and uses the materials that the Council used — yet opens it up.
THE FILES

I have files I’ve kept with the Bishops’ replies and one or two of the drafts. I don’t suppose there are so many pages that it can’t be copied. In any case, I’ve sort of half-promised them now to the IMRI. Because if I die tomorrow, and I’ve no guarantee — I’m no different as a religious than a diocesan priest — someone will come in and throw them all out! So I want to prevent that from happening. I know where it all is. I was going through some of it just a few weeks ago. It’s quite a useful file. I’ve carried it with me from Washington, to Chicago, to Florida. I think it will end up here. It’s more likely to be saved here.

TITLE AND INTRODUCTION

I recall that the title Behold Your Mother Woman of Faith came from Cardinal Carberry. I seem to remember that it started out as simply “Behold Your Mother”, and it was his suggestion — and maybe it also came from some of the other Bishops — to add “Woman of Faith”. It was a good choice. It translates well, too!

There are Spanish and Italian translations; it was reissued by the Bishops of Australia. (There’s also a Hungarian translation.) There is no German translation, that I know of, although the letter has been alluded to.

There were a number of other joint pastoral letters on Mary — from Germany, Switzerland and so forth.

They were much shorter. They didn’t attempt to do what we did. Our intent was to “open up the Council”. That was our template. With a very strong emphasis on the Scriptures.

I did not write the short introduction; again, that was the work of Cardinal Carberry and some of his advisors. It’s a different style. I incorporated it, of course; but that was uniquely exclusively the Bishops’ contribution. Not that they didn’t have a great deal to say about the rest of the content; but that part was theirs.

ON CHAPTER ONE — OUR LADY IN THE BIBLE

It was very important to begin with the Scriptures, because there had been a re-discovery of the Scriptures by Catholics.

For example, I grew up in a devout Irish American Catholic family. Both parents born in Ireland; both devout Catholics. My Mother was
well-read. My Father dropped out of school when he was 11 or 12, as many Irish farm boys did. He had a good vocabulary and had the Irish love of words. My mother was extremely well-read, so she learned the Missal, the Latin-English Missal. (My Father’s Missal when he went to Mass was the Rosary.) There was no Bible in our house. In Roman Catholic families, with rare exceptions, there were no Bibles. I remember buying one for my Mother and my Father, and it was very religiously dusted...

But what the Council did was a great breakthrough, treating Our Lady from a Biblical perspective and emphasizing her faith. It was, I think, enormously valuable. And it’s something to which no one could take strong exception.

Even for those Catholics who thought that the Church had gone too far — that the “Marian age” was a terrible exaggeration — the best answer is “Look at what the Scriptures say about her!”

We figured that this was surely the best possible approach.

Also, Fr. Jelly and I — and many of the others — were involved in ecumenical interchanges. We knew how very important this was — to be able to speak to our Protestant brothers and sisters on a Biblical basis. This was behind all our thinking, I would suggest. This document could be read by other Christians — who may not agree with it — but who wouldn’t take offense by it.

Also, in paragraph 13, “In the history of Israel...” it came into our minds that our Jewish friends would be reading this.

Then we launch right into the “new Eve”. I remember J. Quasten, the famous patrologist who taught at Catholic University and whom I got to know quite well, he said “We really need a thorough investigation of the new Eve concept — for both its Marian and ecclesiological meanings.” And Jaroslav Pelikan — the Lutheran (now Orthodox) scholar — has said the same. Many times. And I agree.

The new Eve theme could have been developed further, but the letter was already twice as long as had been planned.

As I recall, none of the replies by the Bishops suggested shortening it. Also, none suggested lengthening it!

We didn’t get into Our Lady in the “Acts of the Apostles” — her presence there at the birth of the Church — today I would add that. And I probably would so more with “Daughter of Zion”. I wouldn’t do any more than is there about the Book of Revelation. In the figure of the woman in Revelation, I think Our Lady is there, but very subsidiary to the Church. The figure is far and away the Church. To the degree that she
is model and exemplar of the Church, and so forth — beyond that I don’t know what could be added there, respectful of current exegesis.

I can recall the late Father Ray Brown, whom I got to know rather well, saying in a public lecture at Loyola in Chicago a few years ago, “We have the answers...” (He wasn’t bragging.) He said, “No one wants to ask the proper questions.”

A prime example — some will ask, “How many magi were there?” Or, as some of them, even in antiquity, said “What did Mary do with all the gold?” Those are the kinds of questions often asked.

Now obviously, the other extreme is simply to tell people (and I think a priest who does this should be forbidden ever to talk again!) “There were no magi!” That’s totally absurd. Or to say “There was no flight into Egypt” and on and on and on. It is a demonstration of incredible ignorance. There’s so much that can be said, without compromising your own scholarly integrity! There’s so much you can say! The really top rate scholars spent their lives opening the Bible, even to the simple folk — scholars like Ray Brown (d. 1998) and Roland Murphy (d. 2002).

And our hope was that this letter would be read by a great many people. I can’t tell you how many have read it. I’m told it was one of the best-sellers the National Conference of Catholic Bishops ever published.

Another interesting note — for Scriptural references, we used the protocol of the Council. In the original documents, “cf.” is used when they are not taking a stand on it. Whereas, when there’s no doubt, the “cf.” doesn’t appear. This has to do with all the Council documents, including those in moral matters. In almost all the translations, it’s ignored — by those who were not aware of the protocol, the style book. Fr. Rene Laurentin uses it, of course, in his writings, because he had a hand in the Council documents. But it’s a significant point.

An easy example, in Lumen Gentium n. 51 the two Old Testament references have “cf.” but there is no “cf.” for the reference to St. Matthew’s gospel etc. etc.

ON CHAPTER TWO — THE CHURCH’S UNDERSTANDING OF THE MYSTERY OF MARY

There was some opposition to using the term “the mystery of Mary”. Among ourselves, one of the Bishops, and I don’t remember which one, opposed it. But Bishop (later Cardinal) Baum defended it very strongly. And it has to be defended!
It’s the “mystery of Christ”, it’s the “mystery of His Mother”. It’s true! So is the Church.

Regarding the “virginal conception”, many people when they should know better confuse the “virgin birth” and the “virginal conception” — in old terms: “virginitas ante partum”, “virginitas in partu” and “virginitas post partum”. But the term “virginal conception” has nothing to do with the circumstances of the delivery of the Christ Child. In other words, in ordinary English usage “virgin birth” means Mary is the Virgin Mother of Jesus — so reads the ordinary dictionary. “Virginitas in partu” has to do with the actual delivery of the Son of Mary. This is part of the confusion. I’ve seen this mistranslated in other languages. It’s a Christological mystery.

We have to be careful not to call certain truths “dogmas”. Vatican I pinned down the meaning of dogma, as a revealed truth that has been formally so identified. That’s a dogma — identified in a very solemn way. In the back of Denzinger, the truths of the faith that are dogmas are listed — there are less than ten of them! And that doesn’t include some of the principal doctrines of the faith!

It’s common to say, “There are four truths about Our Blessed Lady that are dogmas.” I don’t make a big deal about it — but there are three: Mother of God, Immaculate Conception and Assumption.

We also talk in the letter about the word Theotokos — Mother of God, but more accurately “the God-bearer” or “the forth-bringer of God”, both of which I find cumbersome. But I appreciate the sensitivity to translating Theotokos accurately.

The Protestant fear, often enough, is that Mary has been exalted to the level of divinity — or that this verges on paganism, to describe a human being as the mother of the Godhead. We don’t say that! So Protestants generally dislike the term “Mother of God”.

It’s important we note that the actual term is not Biblical. We’re not quite sure how old it is. We suggest here as early as the third century; I doubt if it was much sooner than that. At least we haven’t found evidence of it.

Some people thought “Theotokos” was the truth to start with in chapter two. We were strongly convinced that it was not. We chose, as the Council also did, to start out with Our Lady in the Scriptures; then move into some of the early witnesses to her in the patristic writings, which is what we did.

And then get into the major doctrines about her, of which obviously the top place is Mother of God.
Also, we don’t know if Our Lady died. It’s not in the wording of the Assumption. We simply do not know. And if she did die, then how long was her body on earth? And if she did die, where was she buried? Double tradition. I don’t think it was in Ephesus, by the way. However, the arguments for Ephesus are not trivial. The Council of Ephesus was held in a church dedicated to her, and there are good scholars who suggest that the ancient church dedicated to Mary may well rest on the fact that she lived in that area. It could be. However, some years back they were digging around in Gethsemane and they invited archaeologists — Jews, Arabs and Christians — to be on the site (that’s common courtesy). They found graffiti at the “tomb of the virgin”. Rather strong evidence that she had at least died there. Much stronger than anything at Ephesus. Though the Ephesus argument doesn’t rest just on the apparitions or the revelations of Catherine Emmerich. The fact that the church was there would be a stronger argument.

In any case, it’s not part of the defined truth of the Assumption.

**ON CHAPTER THREE — MARY, MEDIATRIX AND SPIRITUAL MOTHERHOOD**

Regarding Mary’s mediation, Father Jelly put it so well: “Mary is not a bridge over the gap that separates us from a remote Christ.”

This is in answer to the abuse which occurred at times in the Middle Ages and afterwards that because her Son brokers Justice, you go to the Mother of the Son or the Queen to clear the way for you, to get Mercy.

That’s not good medieval theology; it’s not in Saint Anselm. Anselm has it crystal clear; he has a judgment scene in one of his three prayers to Mary. He makes it incredibly clear that her mercy is totally from her Son. Sister Benedicta Ward gives Anselm’s prayers in the book “The Prayers and Meditations of St. Anselm”, still in print; it’s not on the pastoral letter’s recommended reading list, but it might well have been. It gives the lie to the charge that “it’s part of the abuse of the Roman Church that they forgot the merciful Lord and just gave mercy to His Mother.”

Anything Mary has is from her Son! They are never at logger-heads!

Admittedly, there could be iconographical excesses, like the famous “Last Judgment” in the Sistine Chapel, with Our Lady holding back
the angry Lord. That kind of excess is bad theology. Beautiful art but bad theology!

Regarding Mary’s spiritual motherhood, the letter applies it to all Christians. It is a cherished American Catholic custom to call the Mother of Jesus “our Blessed Mother”. The reason we can do this is that Mary consented in faith to become the Mother of Jesus; first came Mary’s faith, then her motherhood. And through her love and faith she cooperated also in the birth of the faithful in the Church.

**ON CHAPTER FOUR — MARY IN OUR LIFE**

There was little doubt that, at the time of the letter, we were passing through a period marked by lack of interest in the saints. I quoted Karl Rahner, a very apposite quotation, “A special temptation affecting Christians today — to turn the truths of the faith into abstractions. And abstractions have no need of mothers.”

Our Catholic theology is very down-to-earth. We deal with bread and wine, and body and blood, and human bodies. We are a very down-to-earth religion. We profess the humanity of the Risen Jesus.

I was once president of the Catholic Theological Society of America, I think back in 1966. My presidential address was “Mary and the Communion of Saints”. That’s been a lifelong interest to me. And I think it is still very badly neglected. I regard it as the best meeting point with Protestants. Not the Immaculate Conception, surely, not the Assumption. Not the Roman Catholic understanding of her present role as mediatrix. But certainly her role in the Communion of Saints.

I find this to be true in my involvement with the Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary, founded in 1967 — in the United States since 1976. It’s a common conviction. We profess it in the Creed. And if it means anything, it has to mean that there is a bond — not only among ourselves, not only among earthlings! At the same time, there is a bond with the blessed in heaven. And the Communion of Saints brings that out, extremely well.

This is why I deplore that Chapter 7 of Lumen Gentium is so badly neglected. Read it again — it’s so peaceful! There’s no reference or even an implied reference to a conflict in understanding between Protestants and Catholics about Mary’s role as mediatrix. That tension is very much to the fore in Chapter Eight. But in Chapter Seven, it’s simply set aside. We’re able to talk about Mary’s place and the place of all the saints.
in the Communion of Saints without hesitating, or stopping to answer possible objections.

And Chapter Seven is very liturgical.

There are almost no prayers in the liturgy that call on anyone but God the Father. Occasionally, His Son. Sometimes, the Holy Spirit. We do not, in the Mass, directly address Mary. We do not direct our prayers to her. By way of her, yes. Or we ask her to join us in our prayers, fine. But in the Mass, we pray directly to God.

(By the way, today I read an article by Ignacio Calabuig, a Spaniard who is the head of the Marianum. I regard him extremely highly, an incredibly wise man, a beautiful writer. He has an article in Volume 5 of “The Handbook of Liturgical Studies”, which was edited by Anscar Chupungco. It’s terrific! It’s the place of Mary in the liturgy and it’s magnificent. He brings out something I’ve never seen done so well. He points out that it’s customary to say that the first liturgical cult was the cult of the martyrs. Not so, he says. He gives all sorts of demonstrations, starting with the Scriptures — and other writings that have survived that are definitely liturgical in their birth. And Our Lady is very strongly in there — concomitant to the cult of the martyrs. The best of his examples is the Visitation; this, he points out, is a liturgical experience! And that’s where St. Luke got it. He gives evidence to exegetes backing him up. And overall he says there was surely a liturgical cult of Mary before what we have been accustomed to regard as the first emergence of it, after the more open cult of the martyrs. He says it was there from the start.

I think Calabuig had a lot to do with the 46 new Masses and I think he had a lot to do with Marialis Cultus, to the point that he may have been the principal author. That Marianum faculty in Rome has done extraordinary work — and they’re just a handful of people)

Back to our letter — in the chapter, the Bishops say “We view with great sympathy the distress of our people” — distress over the loss of devotion to Our Lady. When you’ve been saying the rosary for years and are suddenly told there are better ways, put the rosaries away and get your Bibles out — the stupidity of that!

I tell people — and it’s just a story — that when my Father might be praying the rosary at Mass or making a visit, it would have been a very foolish usher who would’ve taken away his rosary!

So much of what was done was not fair to the people. It was all part of the confusion! You know, it’s hard to censure people for things that were done, caught up in all the general confusion.
We handled the whole question of the apparitions as best we could, because it’s a question that constantly comes around. I’m pleased we handled it the way we did. I still get phone calls, every now and then, from some reporter or the other asking my opinion about a claim that Our Lady appeared here or there or everywhere. And I answer, “I’ve not been there — all I’ve read about it is what I’ve read in the general press. I can tell you however, the criteria by which the judgment is made.” They’re not interested in that! They thank me, and then hang up!

And of course, many Catholics are astonished to be told that you can be a very good Catholic without believing in an apparition. At the end of paragraph 100, “Even when a ‘private revelation’ has spread to the entire world...and has been recognized in the liturgical calendar, the Church does not make mandatory the acceptance either of the original story or of the particular forms of piety springing from it.” From the Council, we reminded true lovers of Our Lady of the danger of superficial sentiment or vain credulity. We didn’t get any bad reaction. In paragraph 104, where we quote Karl Barth, that’s the heart of the deep Protestant objection. Justification is at the core of the ecumenical difficulty. That’s where the real difference occurs. Mary, for a Roman Catholic (and for the Orthodox as well) is the primary example of cooperating with grace and meriting salvation. Even the language, the word “merit” — that’s not Protestant language. (Think of the old Penance formula — at the end — “We appeal to the merits of Mary and the saints...” That’s not Protestant.) We included Barth because his statement is the core statement of the Protestants’ objection.

ON CHAPTER FIVE — MARY, MOTHER OF THE CHURCH

It was controversial for Pope Paul VI to give Mary the title “Mother of the Church”. Some people felt — and I hope they’ve gotten over it — that he sort of stole a march by doing it at the end of the 1964 session. Actually, the title had been used before.

If the letter were being re-done, more could be said about issues of justice and peace — which are mentioned in the paragraphs on Mary and Youth. Today, that would be expanded. Many young people were so interested in those issues. I taught young collegians in Chicago at Loyola University for twenty years (1980–1999), and I don’t permit anyone to downgrade them. These were good, generous young people.
LITURGICAL CHANGES AND MARIAN DEVOTION

Three things about the introduction of the new calendar of the Roman Missal:

One, February 2 — which for centuries apparently was referred to as the Feast of the Purification of Our Lady — now is called the Presentation of the Lord, which was always the main intent. But the title had been the “Purification”.

Second, March 25, the Annunciation was — and is — regarded as a feast of Our Lady. Now it is called the Annunciation “of the Lord” — which it is, of course. But that was a change.

Third, January 1 — for a long time called the Feast of the Circumcision — is now the capital feast of Our Lady, which it was in the early Church. That confused people — and I think they were further confused when January 1 was also designated as a day of prayer for peace! The calendar changed so often! And you can’t do everything at the same time.

Those are three rather conspicuous changes regarding Mary in the liturgy.

Changes in the liturgy are very upsetting to people. It’s like changing prayers. I don’t want to see the “Our Father” changed. I don’t want to see the “Hail Mary” changed. I don’t want to harp on someone who comes to confession after God knows how long — but remembers those prayers: they may be the only prayers the person knows! They hold onto these. They are lifelines for them. They hold onto these in the precise way they learned them as children!

And the same is true of folks whose language is other than English. People come to me, sometimes Italians, Poles, Slovaks — who do speak English, but their confession prayers are in their native language. It’s very important for them.

In the new calendar, there were fewer Marian feasts, but many more readings available for them in the Lectionary. But some people were very upset about losing some Marian feasts. (Also the loss of favorite saints’ days. There must have been any number of holy people who were called “Valentine” and “Christopher”!)

Recently, the Holy Father has reinserted September 12 as the Feast of the Holy Name of Mary — adding to a nice “octave” from September 8 (Nativity of Mary) to September 15 (Our Lady of Sorrows).

We could have said more about the liturgy in the U.S. Bishops’ letter, but we could only say so much about so many things.
Mary, the U.S. Bishops, and the Decade of Silence:

Cultus — which dealt directly with liturgy and devotion — had not yet appeared. I regard the two documents are complementary in many senses. They keyed into each other, not deliberately, but very appositely. Yet, I say this in one of my articles — my friend Chris O’Donnell, the Irish Carmelite, pointed out a couple of years ago (and Donal Flanagan said the same thing) that Marialis Cultus really didn’t catch on. O’Donnell added that making May 1 a feast of St. Joseph, for example, really didn’t catch on.

“Catching on” is an aspect by which you might judge some of the liturgical changes.

THE “SUGGESTED READINGS”

We chose to limit the suggested readings to twelve. Coming up with the list was a collaborative effort.

Donal Flanagan’s commentary on Lumen Gentium Chapter 8 is very good. It appears in the Franciscan Herald Press’ edition of “The Constitution on the Church”. Quite a few years ago Flanagan left the priesthood and married; I’ve met him several times since, and he still writes quite a lot about Mary and is very active in various Mariological organizations. I believe he made his living as a journalist.

“Prayers and Devotions from Pope John XXIII” is just a beautiful book. The rosary devotions in it are particularly nice.

We decided to include several Biblical books. The Dominican F. M. Braun’s “Mother of God’s People” is good. (Of course, we wanted to include books that were in print and widely available. Not much point of listing something that’s out of print.)

I’ve mentioned before that I got flack for including Raymond Brown’s book on the virginal conception. Even though he’s dead and buried and gone to God, certain Catholics are still after him! He was a member of the papal Biblical Commission and this, that and the other thing, and some still regard him as an enemy!

Lucien Deiss, C.S.Sp., who is well known for his music, wrote “Daughter of Sion”. He writes in French.

“The Poor of Yahweh” by the Sulpician A. Gelin is a great book! It’s a small book, but a great book.

And the great Henri de Lubac’s “Splendour of the Church” is a terrific book. And it’s in print all the time. Ignatius Press owns it now. And we list his famous article too: “Lumen Gentium and the Fathers”, which appears in another one of his books about the Church. The article
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comes from a talk he gave at Notre Dame the year after the Council. I was at that talk.

Heiko Oberman is a Protestant. He worked with Thomas O’Meara, O.P. on “The Virgin Mary in Evangelical Perspective”. O’Meara teaches at Notre Dame.

Karl Rahner’s “Mary Mother of the Lord” is a collection of homiletic material. (Sometimes I’m asked about Karl’s brother, Hugo Rahner. I think he’s better! I do! His writing is much easier to follow. Hugo said he was waiting for his brother Karl’s stuff to be translated, so he could follow it! Yes, Hugo, I think, was probably the better scholar. Maybe not a better theologian, but a better scholar.)

(Cardinal) Joseph Ratzinger’s chapter on “Conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary” is from his book which is an introduction to Christianity. There might be better entries now, but all of these were very good at the time.

“Mary Mother of the Redemption” is one of Edward Schillebeeckx’s very early books. He’s done very little writing on Our Lady, but that book has stood up well.

Max Thurian, a Protestant Calvinist minister associated with Taize, wrote “Mary Mother of All Christians”. He became a Catholic priest, and he gave three reasons why he became a Catholic: the Eucharist, the Blessed Mother, and the Pope. Three good reasons. And they go together.

(I know a couple of Presbyterian ministers extremely well, who really have no serious problem with the Catholic understanding of the Eucharist, or with our Blessed Mother — they have great devotion to her. But the papacy is still the stumbling block for them. And I think that may be true for a number of Protestants.)

AFTER THE LETTER

On the day the letter was released, there was a big press conference in Washington DC, well attended. The Bishops were meeting there at the time.

At the press conference, somebody was after me for two things. First, how did we dare put in the name of the dissenter Raymond Brown in our reading list. And second, how did we dare quote Herbert McCabe, O.P., who had lost his job after protesting “Humanae Vitae”. We quoted him in regards to the Communion of Saints from one of his editorials in “New Blackfriars”.
One of the reporters asked what I thought the Protestants’ reaction might be. The press picked up half of what I said, as usual. I’ve become very wary of the press.

But I did speak to the public — on the lecture tour two years before the letter and then after I was lecturing constantly. I gave an enormous list of lectures — here, there and everywhere — even when I was teaching. It was a young man’s game!

I lived in a house where that was the custom. Roland Murphy was in demand internationally. There were my classmates Chris Ceroke, New Testament scholar, and Ernest Larkin, expert in Spirituality. All of us with doctorates, all good speakers, thank God.

Our names were known. Roland Murphy had arranged — when I came back from Rome — that I would write reviews for “Theological Studies”. By doing that, when greater opportunities came along, our names were known. If you do the dog work of serious reviewing, you establish your right to be heard.

“L’Osservatore Romano”, the English version, ran the whole pastoral letter in two or three segments. And it was printed in different places, in full.

It is in Italian, in Spanish, in French, and in Hungarian. The Australian Bishops used it.

Among the national episcopacies, the Swiss and the Germans published their own letters. The Bishops of the Philippines put out a very beautiful letter. And likely some other countries, too. Perhaps among the South Americans.

But for so many years, there had been so little — practically nothing — on Our Lady. That kind of evidence is compelling! That long period is part of the record.

“Behold Your Mother” was a best-seller, yet we don’t know how many people actually read it! People don’t read — and they don’t read Bishops’ pastoral letters. “Behold Your Mother” is a teacher’s book — obviously written by a teacher — by teachers and intended to be used in that fashion.

**MARIALIS CULTUS**

Flanagan notes that “Pope Paul’s beautifully written and long-awaited apostolic exhortation Marialis Cultus, built on ideas in Lumen Gentium and integrated lines for further development of Marian doctrine
and devotion. Yet it did not make the hoped-for impact. In fact, it singularly failed to overcome the apathy consequent of the Council.”

That’s a very fair judgment. I regard Marialis Cultus as superior to any of John Paul II’s Marian documents. And I like his documents! But Marialis Cultus is far and away the greatest. It is extraordinary. When it was being done, I was one of the people who was consulted, under great secrecy. I don’t know if secrecy means anything anymore. In any case, I couldn’t do it, because I was totally involved in our own. They were both being done at the same time. Ours wasn’t a reaction to Marialis Cultus. Ours came out on November 21, 1973 and Pope Paul’s came out February 2, 1974. And they complement each other, I think, in many respects. I still regard Marialis Cultus — of the papal documents since the Council — far and away the superior.”

Father Ray Brown, whom I knew, said in 1981 talk: “I am not a prophet, but I think that when this century is finished, Paul VI — maligned because he was so subtle — may prove to have been the most adept interpreter of the Second Vatican Council’. When that was picked up by “America” magazine, that sentence was left out of the article. Editors have the right to do such things — but it bothers me.”

Through the ecumenical society, I’ve learned that the praise among Protestants for the document Marialis Cultus is enormous.

Another thing, there was a day in honor of Paul VI that was held in Italy — and they go into his life, his childhood and young manhood, his family. He was chaplain of the Italian student’s organization in early Fascist time, and successfully. He was sacked from the head chaplain’s job, because he was accused in Rome of denigrating devotion to Our Lady. It’s a matter of record. I’m convinced that his experience is well-reflected in Marialis Cultus. He stuck to his guns. What he was doing in fact, he was encouraging university students to read Karl Adam and other modern authors. And to have a much stronger, much more intimate, intelligent involvement in the liturgy. He wasn’t downplaying devotion to Our Lady. Anything but! But among the powers in Rome (and it doesn’t shock me, it doesn’t surprise me) there were people opposed to this. You see, the fear was that Montini was doing this at the expense of the Sodality, the Jesuit Sodality.

THIRTY YEARS LATER

The question is, “Has the Marian crisis ended?” I say, “Yes”, judging from the number of good books that are being published about
her. I mean really good ones. (Some are just dross, and the unlimited number of books about apparitions, which I don’t count as important — and they sell like mad to people who are fearful “looking for new gospels”.)

But good books are selling today.

In the universities, I’m not sure. But I’m not starry-eyed about the way things were. As I’ve said earlier, the treatment of the theology of Mary was like an extended footnote; it was a corollary of some other theological thesis and it really didn’t get the play it deserved. Too often we look back too fondly on “the good old days”; by and large, the “good old days” were “old” — that’s about it, period.

There are more and more good scholarly articles about Mary in larger theological journals. I regard that as a good sign. They are not frequent, but the fact that they are there is encouraging. And sometimes portions of articles. And some of the feminist writings on Mary are very, very good — not just attacks or denials.

Much of what the Council said about Our Blessed Mother simply has not caught on in terms of theological investigation.

Devotional life is reviving — partially, of course, because John Paul II’s Marian devotion has been very strong.

There’s also hope from the number of new or revived religious orders that are Marian. Without exception, the growing communities stress the role of Our Lady. Which was true of all the new congregations in the 1800’s, without exception then. Both the men and women, Marists, Marianists, Oblates of Mary Immaculate, they were all very strongly directed to the Mother of God. And now, those that are thriving have an orientation toward Our Lady.

And the Marian Library here has done a great service to the Catholic Church in the United States.
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